

JPRS 72097

23 October 1978

U S S R

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 12, AUGUST 1978

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

20000412 115

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

160

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22151. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet journal articles displaying a copyright notice and included in this report are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Further reproduction of these copyrighted journal articles is prohibited without permission from the copyright agency of the Soviet Union.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. JPRS 72097	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST No. 12, August 1978		5. Report Date 23 October 1978	
7. Author(s)		6.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201		8. Performing Organization Rept. No.	
		10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.	
		11. Contract/Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above		13. Type of Report & Period Covered	
		14.	
15. Supplementary Notes Translations from KOMMUNIST, theoretical journal of the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow, published 18 times a year.			
16. Abstracts The report contains articles on political, economic, military and social developments and problems within the USSR and as they relate to communist and other countries.			
17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors USSR Political Science Sociology Propaganda Economics			
17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms			
17c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 5C			
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22151		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 160
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price F08

23 October 1978

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 12, August 1978

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year). Where certain articles, reprinted from other Russian-language sources, are not translated, indication of this fact is made in the table of contents.

CONTENTS	PAGE
Major Topic of Scientific Research	1
Highly Efficient Labor Is the Source of Growth of the People's Welfare (L. Kostin)	13
Insatiable Thirst (F. Rodionov)	27
"Code of Honor" in Ideological Struggle (N. Proshunin)	40
Socialist Political Economy: Origins and Problems (G. Kozlov)	55
The Role of Books in Soviet Society (B. Stukalin)	68
Genius of Critical Realism; Writer's Creativity in the Light of Lenin's Analysis (T. Motyleva)	83
'Master of Living Art. . . .'; Romain Rolland (V. Sedykh)	97
Along the Road Mapped Out at Helsinki (Yu. Dubinin and Yu. Rakhmaninov)	103
Contemporary Capitalism and the Problem of Allies of the Proletariat (G. Rudenko)	117

CONTENTS (Continued)	Page
Latin America: New Role in International Relations (V. Bushuyev and Yu. Koxlov)	126
Eternally Live and Developing Doctrine (V. Poshatayev)	139
Fraternal Vietnam's Exploits (N. Sergeyev)	144
Judgment of History (I. Tamginskiy)	151

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 12,
Aug 1978

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Kzdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : Aug 1978

Signed to press : 21 August 1978

Copies : 979,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," "Kommunist."
1978

MAJOR TOPIC OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 3-13

[Text] A. I. Gertsen opened one of his articles on science as follows: "Some problems have been abandoned by everyone, not because they have been resolved but because people have become tired of them; unable to reach agreement, they decide to treat them as incomprehensible, obsolete, and deprived of interest. Consequently, they are ignored." Unfortunately, such instances have been noted among our social scientists as well who, occasionally, soon lose interest in social problems they have discussed yet far from resolved. In other words, essentially, they abandon them at the preliminary stage of a scientific study. "A great deal has been written about this," some specialists say and abandon most topical subjects, without determining what has been written by whom, when, and how, the extent to which it has contributed to scientific knowledge, and the degree to which its partial and incomplete nature could hinder our progress.

Indeed, a great deal has been written on socialist labor and on ways for its development into communist labor. It could not be said that the topic does not attract to this day the attention of the researchers: We have a number of definitive monographs at our disposal. The thorough and specific studies conducted by sociologists in Moscow, Leningrad, Sverdlovsk, and other cities represent noticeable cases of the study of labor problems.

Nevertheless, life, the very practice of economic and cultural construction, induces us, again and again, to take up the topics and problems related to the development of communist labor, already discussed in publications yet still lacking an exhaustive accurate solution. Furthermore, each new temporary stage in the course of our progress toward communism makes new corrections to their consideration.

In the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th Party Congress, drawing attention to problems whose intensified study appears particularly important, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: "This includes, for example, the nature and content of labor under mature socialist conditions and changes in the social structure. The consideration of problems such as

improving distribution according to labor, combining moral with material incentive, socialist way of life, and the development of our many-faceted culture, demands the joint efforts of representatives of the different sciences."

A common feature of the communist and all previous socioeconomic systems is the fact that each of them represents a specific-historical manifestation, within the social relations system, of a specific level of development of social production forces. Yet, in both its stages, communism is substantially different from the preceding systems. It is the product of history which, having entered a qualitatively new stage, can no longer remain as a primarily spontaneous change of events and social forms, but represents a purposeful process of conscious practical fulfillment by the masses of the scientific predictions of the founders of Marxism-Leninism. By this token, the development of communist forms of labor is inevitably linked with its scientific organization.

According to K. Marx labor is the most essential type of human activity in which changes in nature coincide with changes in the people themselves. Regardless of where and when it takes place, labor is inconceivable without live participants, guided by consciously formulated targets and interests, and governed by motivations whose mechanism is determined, in the final account, by the laws governing social production. It is clear, therefore, that a scientific organization of labor must be based on a consideration of the reasons and factors which encourage or discourage participation in it. In terms of a communist society, in the course of its transition from a lower to a higher phase, the solution of this problem necessarily includes the provision of the type of scientific optimal combination of conditions and incentives in which "labor will no longer be merely a means for survival but will become a prime vital need . . ." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 19, p 20). This is one of the basic ideas of the entire Marx-Engels-Lenin theory.

Bourgeois sociological and religious publications abound in views on the alleged inborn laziness of man and the "accidental" nature of dedicated industriousness. Thus, we are familiar with the attempt to define labor as being paralleled by a feeling of dissatisfaction with physical or mental effort provided by us, partially or entirely for the sake of obtaining its useful product. From this viewpoint, reflecting the forced nature of labor under capitalism, regardless of whether its author is aware of it or not, the assumption alone that work could become an organic human need sounds foolish. This is the reason for the widespread views in bourgeois sociology and political economy according to which, while awaiting the quality change predicted by Marx in the attitude of people toward labor, and undertaking its implementation, the communists undertake to resolve a clearly insoluble problem, and are trying "coercively" to remake human nature to which a basic natural aversion to work is "inherent."

In reality, always, under all social conditions, work has been an organic human need. The feeling of repulsion in the masses was created not by the process of labor activity itself but by the type of exploiting, coercive, inhuman forms in which it was conducted. Under capitalism, the negative attitude of the proletariat toward labor is determined by a number of circumstances. First of all, the labor product goes not to the worker but the capitalist; consequently, as a rule, the worker is not interested in what precisely he has made. To him the labor product is important only as a condition for receiving a material reward; secondly, to the extent to which they become alienated, both the efforts and time of the proletariat are lost to it forever. Furthermore, it is precisely the workers and other exploited individuals who assume the main burden of monotonous physical and even purely automatic non-creative mental work, molding the personality one-sidedly and incapable of turning into need.

The sharp contrast between labor and creativity is typical of bourgeois social science. Labor is conceived as a low form of activity, as something absolutely spiritless, as a difficult, physically dirty work, the lot of "blue-collar" workers, of the proletariat. Creativity is presented as the immemorial privilege of the exploiting elite classes. Creativity is the activity of a few among the "chosen" in the higher spiritual areas--philosophy, politics, science, art . . .

Such a drastic pitting of labor against creativity has been merely the ideological reflection of the factually existing conflict within the exploiting society between mental and physical labor, a conflict which reaches the level of class antagonism. In the course of the millennia of their existence, the exploiting societies did a great deal to uproot the creative principle from the activities of the people's masses, reducing them to simple and mindless performance and functioning as simple mechanical force. Bourgeois social science tried to perpetuate this pitting of labor against creativity as something allegedly natural and immutable in the course of the centuries.

However, scientists who have studied the production tools of ancient man, cave paintings, remnants of housing, and ancient architectural monuments of a great variety (including very ancient) epochs, for example, have reached the conclusion that even at that time elements of creativity not directly related to the need to produce means of survival had appeared, revealing the need to work in its simplest form--industriousness. Therefore, we must agree with the scientists who claim that the need for creative activity is not only one of the most noble but the most primeval, deep, and indestructible human needs. Expressions of a vivid mind, creative cunning, and real passion for work both in material achievements and in masterpieces of popular creativity would have been simply inexplicable had work always have the nature of coerced efforts. Life refutes this viewpoint. This also destroys the concept of labor as the eternal curse allegedly cast upon man for the "sins of his forefathers." People have always known of work which would please them and which would be inseparable from their idea of happiness.

Despite its enslaving and forced nature, the work of the artisan, the peasant serf, or the factory worker has always retained a "small spark" (even though hardly visible) of creativity, and the desire to oppose the distorting and numbing power of self-alienation. That is why Marx wrote not of the reappearance of the need to work in a classless society but of the conversion of labor into a prime need of life. In his view, the task is, having changed social relations, to eliminate above all exploitation, and to achieve the type of structural reconstruction of human needs in which the already existing yet suppressed and deformed vital need for vital become dominant and determining compared with all other.

Let us note that in "Das Kapital," before undertaking the study of labor under the conditions of capitalist exploitation, Marx studied the overall labor process in its pure aspect, independent of any specific social form. He singled out three necessary aspects: Expedient activity or labor itself, the labor object, and the labor tool. Target setting, as the most important element of purposeful activities is what distinguishes, above all, labor from semi-instinctive or instinctive forms of animal activities. Labor is the realm of development and realization of all spiritual and human capabilities: Experience, skill, knack, imagination, fantasy, will, ability to predict the results of one's actions, and accurate computation and control. In the course of labor man learns how to master reality: Initially as an idea and, subsequently, in terms of factually reconstructing it not only according to the laws of logic but of beauty as well. All contemporary achievements of civilization and its spiritual and material values are varieties of the conversion into something living the fire of human activities, his very being.

And, as we pointed out, whereas the exploiting society divides the integral labor process into opposites such as labor and creativity, target setting and simple performance, the great historical mission of socialism and communism is to eliminate this antagonism and remove all forms and manifestations of the alienation of the worker in the course of the labor process, converting it into a process of self-assertion of the individual, i.e., a process in the course of which man not only expends physical and mental energy but develops comprehensively his creative capabilities and talents.

In the course of over 60 years of development, the socialist society in our country substantially changed the realm of labor activities. Naturally, here the elimination of private ownership of productive capital, the elimination of exploitation, and the transformation of the working person into the owner of all past and newly created wealth were of decisive significance.

This in itself radically changed the mentality of the toiling masses and their attitude toward labor. Labor began to be conceived as a free activity ("self"-activity!) for oneself, and for the entire society on which the prosperity of each and all depended. This resulted in the appearance of harmful sources of nationwide labor initiative unseen in a class-antagonistic society: Communist subbotniks, socialist competition, shock work, the Stakhanovite movement, and the movement for a communist attitude toward labor. Not only in words but in practical terms labor became a matter of honor, valor, and heroism for millions and millions of Soviet people.

Its productivity has been growing steadily.

It would be impossible to overestimate the significance of the long-term tireless work done by the Leninist party to promote a creative and initiative minded attitude toward labor in all social production sectors. The mass development of inventions, rationalizations, and innovations is its most outstanding (yet far from isolated) result.

Our country's entry into the stage of a developed socialist society under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution has raised new tasks and problems in the realm of labor. These tasks include its further enhancement, i.e., the gradual elimination of heavy, monotonous, and mechanical-performing functions. At the same time, they mark the accumulation of meaningful, research and creative aspects, with a steady growth of the intellectualizing and humanizing of all types of work.

In our time it is no longer sufficient to be concerned with a creative attitude toward labor alone. It is important for the very content of labor in all social production sectors to carry within it the need for a creative approach. Without it labor can not be converted on a mass basis into a prime vital need, into an activity bringing true satisfaction.

Thus, the development of the need for labor is hindered by the fact that a number of specific types of work are related to monotonous labor operations which can not generate a constant creative interest, adverse conditions (noise, drastic temperature changes, dampness, strong smells, and others), and overstress. This includes, above all, manual unskilled (including heavy physical) work which still covers a considerable share of the workers at many enterprises.

The source of the familiar conflict is the following: Essentially, man is pleased with the socially free nature of non-exploited labor. Occasionally, however, he considers its very process unattractive. This contradiction, if based not only on individual tastes, noted comprehensively to one or another extent, is a symptom of still existing disparity between the immediate social nature of labor and its current technical content. It is the direct consequence of the insufficient industrial development of some production sectors which could be surmounted only through the comprehensive mechanization and automation of production operations along with the intellectualization of labor and the enhancement of the cultural and technical standards of the workers. "A drastic reduction in the share of manual labor, and comprehensive production mechanization and automation," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted at the 25th CPSU Congress, "are becoming mandatory conditions for economic growth."

It is obvious that the tactical, so to say, method, for the solution of this contradiction lies in improving the organization of labor, production, and technology, social control of professional selectivity and vocational guidance according to the scale of values of the worker. The strategic solution of

the problem is conceivable only as a result of a conversion to comprehensive production automation in which the share of monotonous and intellectually unsaturated labor is considerably lower (in the assumption of some researches by a factor of 10 or more) compared with contemporary technology. Essentially, it is a question of labor to assume the type of objective characteristics which, by themselves, trigger a deep professional interest, inspire creative capabilities and make possible their utilization.

In this case labor operates entirely as a most important human requirement.

We know that, in addition to being required for labor purposes, a variety of useful objects, material and spiritual goods, and consumer values are the objects of all other needs. The non-production (personal) consumption of such goods could be either strictly individual (such as, for example, the consumption of foodstuffs, use of clothing, and others), or joint ("consumption" of spiritual values--paintings, theatrical performances, books, and others), and short or durable (let us compare, for example, the use of foodstuffs with the need for housing). Despite all such differences, non-production consumption involves the use, the wear of objects created through human toil. In this case consumption "burns up" labor to the ground, turning into its complete opposite.

As to labor for which man feels a vital need, it is a valuable with exceptional characteristics. First of all, the process of this labor is also the process of its consumption, for it is only through it that a person satisfies his creative need, enjoying the "game" and the use of his physical and intellectual forces. Secondly, unlike the other types of personal consumption, the satisfaction of the need for labor, i.e., for "labor-consumption," does not detract from but increases social wealth to an extent which considerably exceeds the totality of goods consumed by the worker at home and at work. Thirdly, here the ideal previously established measure loses its significance: The extent, amount, and intensity of the duration of labor--a measure which every worker considers desirable for himself, based on his non-creative individual consumptions and interests, whether constant or newly arising.

The need for creativity has not traceable boundaries. In this sense it is free. For this reason, a society in which such a need is being comprehensively promoted and disseminated, and in which it indeed plays a primary role in the life of most people, has no reason to fear that the total satisfaction of all other "wasting" needs may bring about the exhaustion of the accumulated goods or the loss of production incentives, for here a person resumes his work not merely for the sake of useful results but for the sake of reproducing, again and again, the happy emotions, the intoxication he feels at the time of creativity. The making of products which satisfy essentially non-creative needs thus stops being the exclusive target of individual labor. This target does not disappear in the case of society at large but is manifested only in the final account, becoming the starting point for the constant renovation of the creative process in human activities.

This leads to the conclusion that the implementation of the communist principle "from each according to his capabilities and to each according to his needs" is organically linked with the transformation of labor into a prime vital need. In turn, this transformation depends on the creation of the necessary social, technical, and cultural conditions which will make it possible for labor to acquire the characteristics we discussed. To this effect we must study both the nature of need for labor as well as the present trends in the development of this need.

Life itself, and the changes occurring under our very eyes in the nature, content, and conditions governing labor formulate a number of most important practical and theoretical problems which must be studied from the positions of socialist political economy, scientific communism, and sociology.

They include, for example, the factors of being interested in work and the satisfaction of this interest. It would be erroneous to pit the meaningful and interesting nature of the work performed against its remuneration, as has been the case, in particular, in a number of sociological studies made in the 1960's. Naturally, the Soviet worker is not an unrealistic idealist, indifferent to improvements in his prosperity. While preferring meaningful work, good relations within the labor collective, and high level organization of the production process, he considers as natural and necessary a proper remuneration for more skilled and intensive work. It becomes even more important to note this fact considering that the wage system inherent in socialism, based on volume and quality, requires further organization and improvements.

Neither the belittling nor exaggeration of the role of moral and organizational factors which contribute to satisfaction with the work, compared with economic factors, would contribute to the formulation of a realistic policy. The former creates mistrust in the shoots of new developments, pessimism, desire to postpone the process of the establishment of communist labor forever, the lack of understanding that this process is already underway and is yielding results, and the expectation that labor will turn into need "miraculously." In turn, the other extreme, in which any even insignificant conscientious attitude toward the work (frequently turning out to be less a social gain than a symptom of basic order in production) is proclaimed to be "communist," leads to the depreciation of very meaningful concepts, creating a distortedly simplistic idea of the future: That which will require many more years or even decades of adamant daily work is occasionally considered imminent. The scientific approach to this problem requires a clear idea of the erroneousess of such extremes and a sober and objective study of the level of development of the need for labor and the extent to which it is satisfied at the present time. Such a study alone would show the conversion of labor into a prime vital need as a real process, and it is only such a study that would enable us to define the stage which the socialist society has now reached in this process.

Providing a scientific explanation to social phenomena created by socialism, occasionally we are faced with a scarcity of precise corresponding concepts. Sometimes we also automatically apply to our system the categories formulated by Marx for describing phenomena within the capitalist society. Thus, socialist political economy and scientific communism, which are continuing to formulate their conceptual apparatus, use in terms of socialist labor the categories of "necessary labor," and "added labor." Since in the case of the worker engaged in socialist production, as co-owner of the productive capital, the products which are used for the further development of social production forces and for the satisfaction of social needs are as necessary as those meeting his individual material and spiritual requirements, the use of such categories under socialism would be correct only in a specific strictly defined sense. To begin with, such a division of labor under capitalism expresses the antagonism between the economic interests of the owners of productive capital and the hired workers. Secondly, in its quantitative aspect, the "necessary labor" is equivalent to the value of the manpower, presuming the conversion of the ability to work into a marketable good and, therefore, the economic separation of the worker from labor means, objects, and products. None of these conditions exists in a socialist society. This means that the use of the "necessary labor" and "added labor" categories in the study of the content of socioeconomic relations essentially fails to provide an adequate picture and could be the reason for the groundless identification of essentially different phenomena.

The erroneous analogies with capitalism, sometimes made by individual scientists (such as, for example, ascribing a broader sense to the law of value and extending its effect to the realm of hiring Soviet workers) can not withstand criticism for the reason alone that under socialism the wage in itself does not offer a complete idea of the level of the worker's material security. It is supplemented, in the course of the distribution process, by the social consumption funds--the typical "added product"--which is today higher than the average monthly wage of a worker or employee in 1940 by a factor of 1.7. Adding to this the fact that, under socialism, distribution can not be oriented toward the value of manpower, since, by virtue of its very nature, socialism is incompatible with the existence of a hired labor market, it becomes clear that the concept of "necessary labor" and "added labor" is used here only with a view to expressing certain quantitative relations which are important from the viewpoint of proper planning of economic development ratios.

The results obtained through sociological studies prove that already now the need to perform socially useful labor is no less important than labor performed for the satisfaction of physical requirements. True, in this case more precise and methodologically accurate rating criteria should be looked for. It is clear, however, that we are dealing with a real possibility which is converted into reality with high technical labor facilities. In other words, under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution and the creation of the material and technical foundations for communism, it appears as a clear trend.

Socialist labor is no longer simply "work dictated by need and external expediency"; it is not forced work whose termination marks considered to be the beginning of the "kingdom of freedom"; socialist labor is a form of free activity which, even though not to the fullest extent, is considerably closer to the ideal of an activity serving "the development of human forces" as a "self-seeking target" (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 25, Part II, p 387), convincingly showing to the toiling mass the meaning of the conscientious and creative self-assertion of the individual. The fact that socialist labor already possesses such characteristics--which is particularly clear at the mature socialist stage--enables us to speak confidently of its inevitable growth into communist labor.

Naturally, we must also soberly assess what remains to be accomplished in order to reach the stage of communist labor. The way ahead is long and difficult. According to the same (obviously, incomplete) sociological data, the share of the external necessity factors affecting the attitude toward labor remains high. In order to lower this share and, subsequently, eliminate it, the old division of labor must be eliminated. This includes major disparities between mental and physical, creative and automatic, and organizational and performing labor. This is a problem which is being specifically resolved through different methods in the individual sectors, enterprises, and skill areas.

In this connection, here again the urgent need is felt for the formulation of precise criteria and methodological approaches which would enable us to distinguish among the functions of mental and physical, and creative and performing labor. The classification of labor into manual, mechanized, and automated must be equally refined. For example, the share of manual work frequently shows a natural tendency to grow in highly automated production, caused by the growing need for fitters, electricians, and tuners. This too must be interpreted and explained.

Changes in distribution methods must also inevitably occur as the developed socialist society advances further. The social consumption funds, already quite significant today, will obviously grow steadily. The formulation of scientifically determined ratios between the two forms of socialist distribution in the immediate future and on a longer range basis becomes, thereby, more important.

Occasionally, some economists have complained that social funds "confuse" all their computations. There is an element of truth in this, since, unfamiliar with the nature of the need for work and failing to assess its economic effect, one could only feel his way, occasionally relying on indirect theoretical substantiations, in determining the share of the divided product depending on it. It would have been simple, abandoning social funds, to consider the sum total of distributed goods as a compensation for the value of the manpower. However, this would conflict with the factual situation: The communist nature and direction followed in the development of the new society. This difficulty can be eliminated only through the

scientific study of the creative and moral incentives for work and the more effective material incentive for work over and above requirements (work according to need is directly stimulated by raising the level of creative interest and the moral assessment), bearing in mind that this form of labor will last long into the future.

Under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution human skills, which rise as technology becomes more complex, will play an ever greater role in the creation of the social product. Science is gradually turning into a direct production force to its fullest extent. Not physical but mental efforts, the "materialized power of knowledge" (Marx) are becoming ever more effective.

The ratio between engineering and technical workers and performing personnel is substantially changing in the new and progressive production sectors: Sometimes skilled specialists may account for over one-half of an enterprise's collective. To an ever greater extent mental labor in the field of science and technology is becoming productive. This leads to the fact that, without being different from the main working mass by its attitude toward productive capital, the engineering-technical intelligentsia directly engaged in the production process is becoming similar to the other categories of industrial workers, literally under our own eyes, steadily coming closer to the most skilled segment of the working class. Actually, it is a question of resolving the problem formulated by the party as early as the 1930's which called upon the working class to create its own production-technical intelligentsia--the production-technical intelligentsia of the working class.

So far the meaning of the "productive work" concept has not been adequately clarified in our literature. In terms of its absolute expression productive toil (for as long as the wealth of society is based on the amount of directly invested working time), according to Marx, is labor which produces material values. It is precisely with such a labor in large-scale capitalist industry that Lenin linked the proletariat (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 44, p 161). On the other hand, under capitalism, direct productive labor is labor which brings profits to the owners of productive capital, regardless of whether or not they procure material goods or provide esthetic pleasure or useful services.

"Therefore," Marx explains, "the school teacher, if we choose an example outside material production, is a productive worker since he not only indoctrinates children but exhausts himself in the course of his work for the enrichment of the entrepreneur. The situation does not change in the least should the latter invest his capital in a training or sausage-making factory. Therefore, the concept of productive worker includes not only the ratio between activity and its useful effect or between the worker and the product of his work but also the specifically social and historically developed production relation which turns the worker into the direct tool for the increase of capital" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 123, p 517). Understandably, under socialism, the assessment of productive toil from the viewpoint of the

growth of profits comes to an end. It is precisely productive labor in the strict meaning of the term, i.e., labor producing material values, that turns into directly productive labor.

The realm of productive labor inevitably changes with the growth and increased complexity of public production under socialism and as a result of the changes introduced by the scientific and technical revolution.

Marx himself proved that under the conditions of highly developed machine production (even more so under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution!) material values are created not only through physical but combined labor (occasionally even with a predominance of mental labor elements), as a result of which the status and role of the engineering and technical personnel change. Their former "superstructural nature" becomes a thing of the past. To an ever greater extent comprehensive production collectives become involved. "The way in nature the head and the hands belong to the same organism," Marx wrote, "mental and physical labor combine in the labor process. Subsequently, they separate and reach hostile opposites. The product is generally converted from the direct product of the individual producer to the social, the common product of the overall worker, i.e., of the combined working personnel whose members are closer to or more distant from the direct impact of the labor object. For this reason the cooperative nature of the labor process itself invariably broadens the concept of productive labor and its carrier, the productive worker. Now in order to work productively there is no need to use one's hands directly; it is sufficient to be an organ of the overall worker and perform one of its subfunctions" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 23, pp 516-517).

This expanded concept of productive labor is consistent with the nature of socialist production in which there is no place for class antagonism and in which the conflict between mental and physical labor is eliminated. True, there still exists a greater or lesser distance between the worker and the immediate influence on the labor object. However, it no longer could be interpreted in any way in a spirit of their class or social incompatibility. The pitting of one against the other as bearers of different "subfunctions" of the productive worker not only loses its social grounds but assumes a strictly negative role.

Obviously, in the future the ratio between production and non-production labor will change even further. A trend to this effect is already noticeable. The work of scientists is having a great impact on the growth of social production effectiveness and, consequently, to a certain extent, is becoming involved in productive labor. The same must be said of the work of production organizers who have greatly contributed to the improvement of production processes.

Unfortunately, our social science has not developed yet an adequately substantiated methodological approach which would enable us clearly to demarcate the limits of productive labor at the present stage. The importance

of resolving this problem not only for the sake of theory but of the practice of economic construction and the planning and control of economic and social development processes is evident. Equally unacceptable here are both alienation from modern reality in which, guided by ethical rather than economic considerations, essentially any socially useful work is proclaimed productive, and the dogmatic unwillingness to take into consideration new processes and phenomena and the tendency to restrict the production area only to people engaged in physical labor.

The present article has discussed merely part of the number of problems affecting the nature, specificity, essence, and ways of development of socialist labor, problems which require further studies through the joint efforts of representatives of various fields of Marxist-Leninist social science.

Marxism found the key to understanding the entire history of society in the history of the development of labor (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 21, p 317). In precisely the same manner knowledge of the process of the communist reorganization of labor may be a key to understanding the nature of and practical ways leading to the building of communism.

5003

CSO: 1802

HIGHLY EFFICIENT LABOR IS THE SOURCE OF GROWTH OF THE PEOPLE'S WELFARE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 14-25

[Article by L. Kostin, first deputy chairman, USSR State Committee for Labor]

[Text] The decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and all practical work of the Communist Party and Soviet state are imbued with concern for the good of the people and the growth of the material and cultural living standards of the working people. The party's plans inspire the Soviet people to creative toil and to new great accomplishments which saturate the life of our homeland. The working people in the country well know that the successful solution of social problems requires adamant efforts and depends on their effectiveness. L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, said: "Comrades, the main thing is how much and how we produce, and our attitude toward labor --the basic source of our social wealth. I believe it unnecessary to prove that one could consume and use only that which has been produced, which has been created through the hands and mind of man. The living standard of the Soviet people is in their own hands. Today we live the way we worked yesterday and tomorrow we shall live the way we are working today." This is the basis of the Communist Party in determining the possibility for improving steadily the life of the people.

Supreme Objective of the Party's Economic Strategy

Under socialist condition the immediate and supreme objective of public production is the satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of the people. The motivating reason for production characterizes the social direction followed in its development, indicating the purpose of the work done by the immediate producers.

The problem of the objective of socialist production was elaborated in its general aspect by the Marxist-Leninist classics themselves. As early as 1902 V. I. Lenin wrote that the socialist revolution will replace private with public ownership and introduce a planned organization of public production "for the sake of ensuring the full well-being and free and comprehensive development of all members of society" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete

Collected Works], Vol 6, p 232). This Leninist concept was reflected in the first and, subsequently, the second party program. It was the basis of the characterization of production objectives under socialism in the current CPSU program and new USSR Constitution. Article 15 stipulates that "the supreme objective of public production under socialism is the fullest possible satisfaction of the growing material and spiritual needs of the people."

To determine the objective of public production means to be aware of the basic economic law of society and its main motive force and source of development. Since economic relations appear above all as interests, the objective of the economic activities of the people is determined directly by their economic interests. Under capitalism it expresses the interests of the ruling classes, the private owners of productive capital. In "Das Kapital" K. Marx pointed out that "the production of added value is the determining objective of capitalist production . . . " (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 23, p 240). This is achieved by exploiting the majority of the population whose consumption is merely a condition for the reproduction of capitalist profit. Under capitalism the interests of the working people conflict with those of the bourgeoisie.

Under socialism production relations radically change the objective of public production. Here it expresses the interests of all members of society, for the public ownership of productive capital creates a unity of interests. As F. Engels noted, under socialism "the community of interests becomes the basic principle in which public interest is no longer distinct from the interest of the individual" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 2, p 538).

However, the basic economic law characterizes not only the objective of the production process but the means for achieving it as well. The objective of socialist production is attained through its steady development and improvement.

Under public ownership conditions of an equal attitude of all toward productive capital, the prosperity of the individual working person depends on the public wealth. Therefore, all members of society are interested here in the development of the economy and, naturally, the purpose of the production process--the service of consumption--coincides with the objective of the socioeconomic system. Socialism is historically the first to offer the possibility and necessity to control production in accordance with developing needs. The development of production under socialism is directly aimed at upgrading the prosperity of the working people, while the growth of their material and cultural standards is an important prerequisite for the further growth and improvement of public production. This leads to the appearance of an essentially new dialectical interrelationship between production and consumption under socialism. These theoretical stipulations were further developed in the materials of the 25th CPSU Congress and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's works.

It was pointed out at the congress that the party's economic strategy begins with the formulation of tasks and the setting of basic long-range targets. The steady upsurge of the material and cultural standards of the people remains the highest among them. Under developed socialist conditions as well both our possibilities and social needs have become different. The supreme objective of the production process is fulfilled ever more completely. It is a question not only of meeting prime material and spiritual human requirements but of creating conditions for the all-round improvement of the individual, and the comprehensive development of all aspects of the socialist way of life. It is precisely now that a substantial turn of the economy toward the ever fuller satisfaction of various human needs has become possible. In his article "A Historical Landmark on the Way to Communism" Comrade L. I. Brezhnev wrote that "today the supreme objective of socialist production becomes, directly and immediately, the focal point of the party's practical policy. This shows ever more completely and vividly the historical advantages of socialism as a means of production and way of life and its fully humane nature."

The question of the ways and means for achieving said targets is formulated differently under developed socialist conditions. Today priority is given to upgrading public production effectiveness, ensuring the fuller utilization of intensive factors for economic growth, and comprehensively improving work quality at all national economic levels.

The possibilities for upgrading the living standards of the working people are directly dependent on the level of economic development and on specific historical conditions. By virtue of a number of reasons, in the period of laying the foundations for socialism, the possibilities for the growth of the people's welfare were limited. However, at all stages in the development of our society this growth has always been the party's main concern. The overthrow of capitalism, the execution of the new economic policy, the industrialization of the country and collectivization of agriculture, the cultural revolution, the solution of the national problem, and the building of the developed socialist society have all been inseparably linked with the implementation of the highest objective of the party's economic strategy, and the task of comprehensively improving the life of the Soviet people.

Let us note that the consideration of such an important aspect in the activities of the Communist Party has been so far the subject of insufficient attention in our sociological literature. Many problems are being studied on an isolated basis. No complete picture is being drawn on the struggle waged by the CPSU for steadily upgrading the living standards of the people at the different stages of the building of socialism and communism.

Under developed socialist conditions the growth of the production of the overall social product and the national income made it possible to increase both the scale and pace of raising the living standard of the people. Thus, whereas in the pre-war five-year plans (1929-1940) real per capita income (the most general indicator of the people's welfare) rose by a 1.3 factor while within the same time span, between 1966 and 1977, it rose by a factor of 1.8. Within that period the average monthly wage of workers and employees rose from 96.5 to 155.2 rubles. Social consumption funds rose at an even faster rate.

The possibilities for the implementation of the party's supreme objective over the next 15 years are determined by the fact that within that time available material and financial resources will approximately double compared with the preceding period. This will mark the reaching of a qualitatively new level of satisfaction of the people's needs.

New substantial progress was planned for and is being achieved in the 10th Five-Year Plan along all directions in increasing the people's welfare. Real per capita income will rise 21 percent and its absolute growth will be higher than in the previous five years. The task is to ensure the fuller satisfaction of the growing solvent population demand. The average wage of workers and employees will be raised by nearly 17 percent, reaching 170 rubles monthly by 1980. In the 10th Five-Year Plan the minimum wage of workers and employees will be raised to 70 rubles per month in all national economic sectors. The rates and salaries of workers in the non-production sphere will be raised as well. Their wages will be raised by an average of 18 percent. This measure has been already implemented in the areas of the extreme and European north, the Far East, Siberia, the Urals, Kazakhstan, Central Asia, along the Volga and the Volgo-Vyatskiy Rayon. It will cover 31 million people and raise outlays by over 7 billion rubles per year.

The introduction, this very five-year plan, of payments based on length of service in the coal, metallurgical, textile, and some other industrial sectors, and the continuing rise in social consumption fund payments and benefits are of great importance. The further systematic elimination of the socioeconomic and living standard disparities between town and country will be continued and so will the equalization of living conditions among workers, employees, and kolkhoz members.

As a result of the faster growth of real kolkhoz income, its level in terms of the real income of workers and employees (per family member) rose from 75 percent in 1965 to 87 percent in 1977. The planned 26 percent increase in the income of kolkhoz members from the public farms this five-year plan will substantially equalize the living standards of kolkhoz members, workers, and employees.

The equalization of the general educational and cultural standards between workers and kolkhoz members, and country and town residents is developing at an even faster pace. A reduction of disparities in income levels and in the way of life of the main population classes and social groups and working people of different nationalities and parts of the country characterizes the growing social homogeneousness within the Soviet society.

Concern for human health is a most important social task. By the end of the five-year plan the number of physicians in our country will exceed 970,000. This is one-third of all physicians in the world for a population slightly in excess of six percent of that on the planet. The congress called for substantially improving the work quality of medical institutions, launching an extensive fight against the most dangerous diseases, and ensuring the

increased production of medical equipment and highly effective medicines. A specific program of measures for the implementation of this task is contained in last year's CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures for the Further Improvement of the People's Health Care."

Housing construction will be developed extensively. Here prime significance is ascribed to upgrading the quality of housing and improving its comforts and layout. Let us point out that rental payments in our country have remained steady since 1928 even though in the past decades wages have increased several fold and the quality, technical facilities, and convenience of the apartments have improved greatly. Today rentals cover only one-third of the current expenditures for the maintenance of housing resources while the remaining two-thirds--over five billion rubles per year--are assumed by the state.

The social program implemented in the 10th Five-Year Plan is of a comprehensive nature, calling not only for higher income, housing construction, and improvements in health care, but the solution of a number of other problems determining the development of the socialist way of life.

Considerable improvements in socioeconomic and production labor conditions are planned, as work is the main realm of human activities, along with the intensification of the creative nature of labor, its intellectualization, and the all-round reduction of manual, unskilled, and heavy physical work.

With a view to ensuring the further growth of spiritual and social requirements, education, cultural institutions, and the use of all new opportunities for the manifestation of the social activity and initiative of the working people and their participation in production management are contemplated. Great attention will be paid to the efficient utilization of non-working time which will require improvements in all areas of services, easing household chores, and improving the organization of the recreation of the Soviet people. Problems of environmental protection, extending the life-span and active human efforts, the creation of more favorable conditions for raising children, and improving the organization of the health care of mothers and children play an important role. This is the first time that a number of such problems have been formulated.

Development of Production and People's Consumption

The steady growth of the prosperity of the Soviet people is based on the dynamic development of output, increase in the national income, and consumer goods production. Last five-year plan our country was struck by two poor harvest seasons. This could not fail to influence the development not only of agriculture but of the light and food industry sectors as well. Nevertheless, impressive results were achieved in the development of output and in upgrading the living standard of the people. In the Ninth Five-Year Plan the volume of industrial output rose 43 percent while the average gross agricultural output rose 13 percent. The production of consumer goods rose

considerably. The Soviet Union holds the leading position in the world not only in coal (industrial) and petroleum extraction, steel smelting, and the production of cement and chemical fertilizers, but the production of woollens, leather shoes, household refrigerators, sugar, milk, and animal fat. Substantial changes have taken place in favor of the consumption of the highest quality foodstuffs. The availability of durable consumer goods has increased considerably.

In the 10th Five-Year Plan the national income is scheduled to rise 26 percent on the basis of the development of output, or 93.5 billion rubles in terms of absolute growth, compared with 80 billion in the Ninth Five-Year Plan. The implementation of the social program will be assisted by the faster increase in the consumption fund compared with the accumulation fund.

As stipulated at the 25th Party Congress, further progress in agricultural production and in the increased output and improved quality of consumer goods are considered the main economic problems at the present stage.

Currently agricultural production and industrial goods based on agricultural raw materials account for nearly three-quarters of the consumer goods. For this reason the further strengthening of the material and technical base of agricultural production and its growth are of prime importance to the people's welfare. The difficulty of the problem is caused by the complex conditions in our agriculture. Thus, the sum total of soil and weather factors affecting USSR agriculture is approximately half as good as in the United States. For this reason quality changes in agricultural production require, occasionally, large amounts of time, labor, and investments. This five-year plan capital investment in agriculture will total 170 billion rubles or triple the volume of capital investments in the national economy in the entire pre-war period. The farm workers are faced with the task of more rationally and effectively utilizing these funds with maximal returns. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said the following at the July 1978 CPSU Central Committee Plenum: "The solution of the major and complex problems formulated by the CPSU Central Committee in agriculture will enable us to raise the people's welfare to a new level. This is the meaning of the measures submitted for the plenum's consideration. The reaching of these objectives will require the intensive efforts, energy, and creative initiative of the masses, the party's entire rich experience, and the knowledge and organizational skills of its cadres."

The caloric content and quality of nutrition of our people have sharply increased under the Soviet system. According to scientific norms, however, without increasing the overall caloricity of the food (which today is entirely adequate and, occasionally, even excessive), we must increase the consumption of meats, vegetables, and fruits, while lowering the consumption of potatoes, bread products and, obviously, sugar. The development of agriculture is the most important but not exclusive factor in resolving the food problem. It is very important to bring to the consumer the farm produce with the highest returns and lesser losses. The food problem, therefore, must be considered, planned, and resolved comprehensively. This includes

problems of food product storage, transportation, processing, packaging, and marketing. Let us note that despite the tremendous capital investments in agriculture, outlays for the development of related sectors which supply consumers with foodstuffs are inadequate and that, obviously, a certain redistribution of such funds is necessary. The July 1978 CPSU Central Committee Plenum stipulates that along with increasing capital investments in agriculture we must "also ensure the allocation of necessary resources for the faster development in the 11th Five-Year Plan of agricultural machine building, the production of chemical fertilizers and plant protection means, the processing industry, and all other sectors within the agroindustrial complex."

Today one of the main tasks in upgrading the people's welfare is the fuller backing of the population's solvent demand for commodities and services and the elimination of the scarcity of some goods. The importance of this problem is enhanced by the amounts of population savings. The sum total of the population's deposits in savings banks rose from 46.6 billion rubles in 1970 to 116.7 billion in 1977; at the beginning of 1978 it had reached 120 billion. The shortage of some consumer objects effects the satisfaction of the population's needs and the use of the monetary income, lowering the effect of material labor incentives. Along with the fast increase of agriculture, the party ascribes the increased production of consumer goods tremendous significance. The 25th Congress noted that the situation in the sectors producing such goods is unsatisfactory. The five-year plan calls for a 32 percent increase in the output of group B sectors. However, such assignments remain minimal. The task in the formulation of annual plans is to ensure the accelerated expansion of these sectors. Under present conditions its implementation assumes major importance. The share of group B sectors in our country is lower, while that of group A sectors is higher than in many foreign countries. This developed historically and was necessary due to the need for fast industrialization and for strengthening the country's combat capability. Now, when we have reached a tremendous production potential, the successful development of the economy and the solution of social problems require, along with the further powerful growth of heavy industry, the high technical level and adequately high scale of development of all sectors producing consumer goods. Let us emphasize that the group B sectors have considerably higher monetary indicators of capital returns and output per worker. The fast development of these sectors is having a positive influence on upgrading the effectiveness of industry as a whole.

In December 1976 the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers passed a decree "On the Development in 1976-1980 of the Production of Goods in Mass Demand and on Measures to Upgrade Their Quality." It issued union ministries and departments and councils of ministers of union republics assignments on increasing the production and broadening the variety of such goods. The production of high quality goods enjoying greater demand must be increased to the greatest extent.

In the future, while drafting the long-term plan for the development of industry, it will be very important to formulate and consider several alternatives of this plan containing different growth rates, and changes in the share and volume of capital investments of groups A and B. This will enable us to choose the optimal solution from the viewpoint of ripe social problems and increased production effectiveness.

Tremendous possibilities exist in upgrading the quality and variety of consumer goods. For the time being the share of superior quality goods in the light, food, and meat and dairy industry sectors remains insignificant.

As we know, heavy industry enterprises play an important role in increasing consumer goods production. They account for approximately three-quarters of all consumer and domestic goods. The manufacturing of such goods as non-ferrous metallurgy, chemical machine building, and electronic industry enterprises has increased considerably. Many local party organizations, the Moscow and other party obkoms in particular, play great attention to this. However, the possibilities of heavy industry in this respect are far from completely used. In a meeting with ZIL workers Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: "Occasionally the following may happen in our country: A big plant would produce good quality basic goods. Yet, it is unwilling to do the same for consumer goods. Even were it to produce them, such goods are not always to the liking of the consumers."

Poor coordination exists in the production of goods in mass demand. They are manufactured by over 10,000 enterprises. Each of them frequently resolves variety, volume, and quality problems independently. The head ministries occasionally avoid the formulation of technical policy in this area. Yet, it is precisely they that bear full responsibility for supplying the population with goods in the required variety and quality regardless of the departmental affiliation of one or another enterprise.

It also happens that, instead of increasing the production of complex and scarce goods, some big and technically advanced enterprises produce the simplest varieties. Essentially, they are following the path of least resistance. Many such shortcomings were noted in the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Work of Party, Soviet, and Economic Organs of the Ukrainian SSR on the Implementation of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers Decrees on Accelerating the Development of the Production of Consumer Goods." The decree is of essential importance to all union republics and all sectors related to the manufacturing of consumer goods.

The speech by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 25th CPSU Congress pointed out most straightforwardly the need "decisively to change the attitude toward anything related to the satisfaction of the daily needs of the people, and ensuring radical changes in the quantity and quality of goods and services."

The successful solution of production problems and the increased production of foodstuffs and other consumer goods are inseparably linked with highly effective work. The mature socialist society substantially upgrades

requirements concerning the development of the main productive force--the working people--and the creation of conditions for the all-round development of their capabilities and creative efforts. In turn, the creation of such conditions largely depends on the living standard, on the extent to which material and spiritual needs are met. Under contemporary conditions upgrading welfare becomes one of the important economic prerequisites for the fast growth of output and an ever more urgent requirement for economic progress.

Providing the broadest possibilities for the all-round advancement of the capabilities of man, socialism shapes his requirements as well. They become legitimately broader and loftier. New and higher requirements arise. This process develops particularly intensively under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution. The consumption structure changes dynamically. It becomes ever more consistent with the sensible requirements and ideals of the member of the socialist society. Such changes are made deliberately, on a planned basis, in accordance with the level of development of production and culture, in the interest of the entire people.

The development of needs depends to a decisive extent on the production method. Material requirements and the level of their satisfaction are more closely linked with the level of development of production forces, while spiritual and social requirements are related to the development of production and other social relations. With the development of communist construction the very need for creative, meaningful, and highly organized work assumes a growing significance. A conscientious attitude toward labor as a creative process becomes not only an important prerequisite for upgrading the effectiveness of labor itself but for the all-round development of the individual. Intellectual needs and their satisfaction are becoming ever more significant. This, in particular, is manifested in the tremendous yearning of the masses for books and knowledge. All this characterizes the establishment of a new, a socialist way of life. The structure of human needs inherent in it is distinguished by the growing share of spiritual requirements.

Socialism presumes the harmonious and all-round development of the individual. In this case there can be no duplication of the bourgeois way of life with its waste, private ownership aspirations, and neglect of moral and other human values. In our country the planned control of production and consumption, and the amount and differentiation in wages and real income create conditions for the development of sensible needs consistent with the nature of the socialist way of life. This is a guarantee for the further successful development of the economy and the ever fuller satisfaction of the people's requirements.

A Most Important National Economic Task

Success in the implementation of all our plans is predetermined by the growth of labor and production effectiveness in all economic sectors and realms of activity. This is a basic problem of party economic policy, a key problem whose solution determines the implementation of our socioeconomic program.

Addressing the 18th Komsomol Congress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that, "one of the most important aspects of today in our homeland is the struggle for effectiveness and quality. This is no seasonal campaign. It is a party course charted most seriously and on a long-range basis. It is not only the key task of the current five year plan but the determining factor of our economic and social progress for many years ahead." Many related problems (effectiveness indicators, criteria, social aspects, and so on) still require further theoretical elaborations. However, the basic problems in this area were already clearly formulated at the 25th Congress and in subsequent party decisions.

In its most general aspect economic effectiveness is determined by the ratio between results and outlays. Results in a sector or enterprise are expressed in the quantity and quality of output; in the national economy at large they are manifested in the overall social product and, in the final account, the national income. Expenditures consist of labor outlays and outlays for productive capital and raw and other materials. Hence the most important effectiveness indicators are labor productivity, capital returns, and material intensiveness of output.

In our country the growth of industrial output has always followed two directions: The first is related to increasing the number of employed personnel (extensive); the second requires increased labor productivity and better utilization of equipment and other production resources at operating enterprises (intensive). Presently, as we know, possibilities for increasing manpower in material production sectors have become considerably lower. This is caused by a number of circumstances (lowered birthrate, use of manpower reserves at home, rapid increase in the number of people engaged in the non-production sphere, and increased duration of full-time youth schooling). Therefore, to an ever greater extent, today and in the future, the growth of output will be achieved primarily by increasing the role of intensive factors. Thus, in the Ninth Five-Year Plan higher labor productivity accounted for 84 percent of the overall increase in industrial output. Never before had such a high indicator been reached in the country's history.

In the course of the previous five-year plan the growth rates of labor productivity in industry and construction were accelerated. In industry they accounted for 34 percent, compared with 32 in the Eighth Five-Year Plan; in construction--29 as against 22 percent. Assignments related to this indicator were successfully carried out by the enterprises of the ministries of non-ferrous metallurgy, instrument making, automation equipment and control systems, automotive industry, construction materials industry, and others. A great deal has been done to improve this most important quality indicator in Belorussian enterprises, the Baltic Republics, Kievskaya Oblast, and Udmurtskaya ASSR. A number of leading plants, factories, and associations fulfilled ahead of schedule their five-year assignments for the growth of labor productivity. They include the Leningrad Svetlana Association and Moscow's Dinamo Plant. Their experience indicates that many collectives have great possibilities for reaching high economic indicators.

Under present conditions raising social labor productivity one percent means, for the national economy at large, an increase in the national income in excess of four billion rubles. This amount would be sufficient for the building of five plants of the size of that in Krasnoyarsk, considered the biggest in the world.

The all-round increase in labor productivity remains the most important task in our economic development. In the 10th Five-Year Plan social labor productivity in the national economy as a whole will be increased 25 percent, as against 24 percent in the Ninth Five-Year Plan, thus enabling us to save the labor of 26 million workers.

However, a number of difficulties and shortcomings exist in the solution of this problem. The Ninth Five-Year labor productivity assignments remain somewhat underfulfilled, while this five-year plan there has even been a noticeable trend toward slowing down its growth rates.

This is a very complex and difficult matter which requires the maximal utilization of all internal reserves, and increased responsibility, organization, and discipline in all areas of economic work. Now the task is for all national economic sectors substantially to accelerate the growth rates of labor productivity. This calls for using all available means to raise it and to ensure the most rational and effective utilization of labor resources.

However, a number of production associations and enterprises are not fulfilling their plans for the growth of labor productivity. Low labor productivity growth rates were maintained in ferrous metallurgy and the coal, meat and dairy, and fishing industries.

In the elapsed part of the five-year plan a number of enterprises and associations failed to fulfill their socialist obligations for upgrading productivity. Such obligations are as a rule, higher than the planned indicators. That is the reason for the particular importance assumed by the stipulations in the document of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers "On the Results of the Visit to Siberia and the Far East Paid by L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary, and USSR Supreme Council Presidium Chairman," which states: "Guided by the stipulation that the plan is the main instrument for the implementation of the party's economic policy, all party, soviet, and economic organs must focus their main efforts on ensuring the strict implementation of planned assignments and accepted socialist pledges for 1978 and the five-year plan as a whole."

Along with labor productivity capital returns are a most important effectiveness indicator. They characterize the level of utilization of basic productive capital--the tremendous resource of the people, acquired after many years of work and currently assessed at worth over 930 billion rubles. The growth of our prosperity will largely depend on the way we put such assets to work. The quality of the assets, particularly newly created ones, also

plays a considerable role. Therefore, higher capital returns depend not only on enterprise work but, to a rather substantial extent, on the effectiveness of the work done by scientists and designers who create the machines and equipment, the technical and economic parameters of the new mechanisms, their productivity, and the lowering of costs per unit of efficiency. At the present time this problem is not always being successfully resolved. The "Fundamental Directions in the Development of the USSR National Economy in 1976-1980" clearly stipulate that "in terms of their technical and economic indicators per unit of productivity and other useful results, the developed machines, equipment, instruments, and technological processes must be superior to the best domestic and worldwide achievements." It is emphasized that in setting wholesale prices of new goods, machines and equipment in particular, it is necessary to plan for lowering their level per efficiency unit. The implementation of this instruction is a major prerequisite for raising capital returns in the national economy.

The accelerated reaching of capacity of new enterprises also contributes to improved capital returns. In recent years capacity has been reached in 28 months, on an average, which exceeds the normed limit by one-half. For example, over one-half of the existing enterprises whose term for reaching capacity has expired are still not operating at full capacity.

In the Ninth Five-Year Plan the CPSU Central Committee approved the work of The Ministry of Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry on the technical retooling of existing production facilities and improving the utilization of capital assets. Here capital returns per ruble productive capital rose considerably. In the Ninth Five-Year Plan the ministries of instrument making, automation equipment and control systems, machine tool and tool building industry, chemical industry, and electrical equipment industry improved this indicator in their enterprises.

The experience of these ministries proves the existence of extensive possibilities. One of them is expanding the reconstruction of existing enterprises. Positive experience has been acquired in this area by the enterprises of Sverdlovskaya, Ivanovskaya, and many other oblasts.

We should point out, however, that despite the instructions issued at the recent party congresses to the effect that under present conditions a greater share of capital investments should go to reconstruction and technical retooling of existing enterprises, many ministries continue to appropriate substantial capital investments for the construction of new enterprises for which the full manpower complement will not be reached over a number of years. Meanwhile, the equipment at operating enterprises with skilled cadres is becoming obsolete.

Upgrading the shift coefficient of the equipment is an important lever for improving capital utilization. The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On the Further Development of Machine Building in 1978-1980" pointed out that "the machine building sectors are making poor use

of production reserves. The shift coefficient of equipment work is rising too slowly." The leading enterprises are resolving the problem of upgrading the equipment work shift coefficient through the development of multiple machine tool servicing, accelerated mechanization of auxiliary operations, and directing the workers thus released to basic production work.

Let us emphasize that under contemporary conditions the decisive and extensive replacement of obsolete equipment is becoming ever more important in terms of upgrading labor productivity and capital returns in industry. So far, in our country this process is slow in developing. In the Ninth Five-Year Plan the annual writeoff of machine and equipment capital assets equalled 2.4 percent in industry, compared with 2.2 percent in the Eighth Five-Year Plan with no increase showing in the current five-year plan. The production process is burdened by machine tools and mechanisms inconsistent with modern requirements. Experience indicates the economic expediency of raising the load and shift coefficient of highly productive equipment and of removing underproductive and obsolete equipment. In this connection, we must not ignore the problem of improving labor conditions. Naturally, this is legitimately related to new machines, automated lines, and so on.

Higher labor effectiveness also means the more efficient utilization of raw materials, fuel, electric power, and other material resources, and the lowering of material intensiveness of output. The 10th Five-Year Plan calls for saving 14 to 16 percent of rolled ferrous metals in machine building and metal processing, 5 to 6 percent cement and 12-14 percent lumber in construction, and 5 percent electric and thermal energy. In absolute terms these figures are quite impressive. Thus, electric power savings should approximate 50 billion kilowatt hours per year. This exceeds the combined output of powerful electric plants such as Bratsk and Krasnoyarsk. The solution of such problems presumes the extensive use of progressive design, improved technology, increased output of more economical types of raw and other materials, their more extensive and comprehensive processing, and the all-round utilization of secondary resources.

In the past two years the material intensiveness of the public product has been lowered as a result of which raw material, material, fuel, and other labor object savings totalled approximately five billion rubles. However, here again major tasks remain to be accomplished.

At the December 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum it was stated that one of the main possibilities for accelerating the development of our economy is the thrift and efficient utilization of all our resources, of everything produced by the national economy.

With every passing year our economy requires ever larger numbers of raw material resources which must be found in ever more remote areas in the north and the east. As a result, labor outlays for their extraction and transportation are rising. Consequently, every percentage of raw and other material savings means ever greater labor savings in the extracting sectors. The reduction of losses must be considered on the same level.

The participants in the socialist competition for the successful fulfillment for the plan for the third year of the 10th Five-Year Plan are focusing their main attention on upgrading labor effectiveness in all economic sectors and areas. The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU, and Komsomol Central Committee Letter on the Development of the Socialist Competition for the Fulfillment and Overfulfillment of the 1978 Plan and for Upgrading the Struggle for Higher Production Effectiveness and Work Quality directs the attention of all working people to this fact. The increased effectiveness and work quality of every working person and each labor collective is the prerequisite for the further successful development of the national economy and the steady upsurge of the people's welfare.

5003

CSO: 1802

INSATIABLE THIRST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 26-34

[Essay by F. Rodionov]

[Text] An extraordinary event happened even though there seemed to be no conflict. The famous worker Aleksey Ivanovich Besspalov resigned from the plant. He wrote to the editors that, "I left because I had no work. I long tolerated a partial load. I appealed to the foreman and the shop chief: 'Give me work!' Yet, shop chief Vladimir Petrovich Levashov said: 'I am not about to go looking for work for you.' After that I personally moved from one shop to another: 'Bring me the work, I will do it.' I did not ask for money but for work, the more complex the more interesting."

We speak of great scientists and great engineers. Aleksey Ivanovich is a great worker. His rating, kept by the personnel department of the plant which he was forced to leave reads: "Comrade Besspalov A. I. is member of the plant's and city's council of innovators. He is a lecturer with the Knowledge Society of the RSFSR and the USSR on the dissemination of progressive experience. He is the author of three books issued in several editions. At present the manuscript of a new book has been approved. He is the author of many rationalization suggestions applied in our plant and at plants in Leningrad, Volgograd, Khar'kov, L'vov, and others. On his initiative the technology used in machining many parts in a number of plants has been changed. Comrade Besspalov A. I. demonstrates his new equipment both at the shops of his enterprise and at other plants. . . . He is the bearer of the Winner of the Socialist Competition Badge of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU, and Komsomol Central Committee."

How could it happen that such a worker left the plant because of insufficient work?

We met Aleksey Ivanovich late one evening. Immediately after completing his shift he would go to the machine building institute to correct some things in the book whose manuscript he was completing. The topic was of interest to the scientists. They asked Besspalov to deliver a lecture to the

department's personnel. He seemed tired and we were unable to have a conversation, even though initially he seemed quite willing to say good things about the person he had complained about to the editors:

"I felt insulted by Levashov. Yet, generally speaking, he is a good organizer. After his appointment as shop chief his strictness and willpower put an end to drunkenness which was flourishing among us. He then proceeded to accomplish more. He handled bonus funds properly. He awarded high bonuses to those who produced. The shop made a breakthrough and started working properly. I wanted to help Levashov," Aleksey Ivanovich said smiling slightly. "We expected things to become even better. The trouble is, however, that Levashov got stuck on the rubles. He got stuck and stopped. This marked the beginning of everything." Bespalov paused thoughtfully and, seemingly recalling the past, said: "Anyway, come to see me at my present plant. You will understand how there may be a shortage of things to do. Considered wrongly, one could even see grubbing where the only prevailing thing is the will to work . . ."

I went to visit Bespalov, thinking of his words: "Give me work. I do not ask for money but for work." What pain and eagerness to work these words expressed . . .

In the shop I did not find Aleksey Ivanovich at his workplace. I found him in the midst of hot casting. Specialists were crowding him, attentatively watching his actions. He was on his knees, looking down at the floor with the blood rushing to his face, patiently measuring each rod, turning the mold. Finally, he stood up, checked once again carefully his computations with the Vernier, and briefly said:

"The rods are three millimeters longer. Obviously, the mold is swollen."

Leaving the casting shop, Aleksay Ivanovich launched the conversation:

"I am frequently told that I am not minding my own business. Yet, how could it fail to be my business if this part will reach me one way or another? By then, however, it will be defective. So, it is better to stop the defect with the first batch, before it spreads . . ."

A boy appeared from behind a machine tool, asking:

"Uncle Lesha the attachment you made for me yesterday is wobbly. Could you take a look?"

Bespalov disappeared for a few minutes. He came back, pleased, and we moved on. Literally the next moment, however, the foreman stopped us in a narrow passage, spread out a drawing and asked Aleksey Ivanovich to see whether an error had been made. Finally, we reached his work bench. Yet, even here, we could not talk calmly. Constantly people came to see him: "Lesha, Uncle Lesha, Aleksey Ivanovich . . ." One after another, they came seeking advice.

Aleksey Ivanovich did not immediately answer. He searched his memory for an answer and then, slowly, haltingly, gave his explanation, making sure that the worker had understood it correctly.

At a given point Aleksey Ivanovich turned and said, as though apologizing:

"One can not say no to the people. They do not come here for personal matters but for production problems."

"When do you find time for your own work?"

"When?" Bespalov repeated. He squinted his eyes and specified: "I finished my last order sometime soon after lunch. Usually I divide my working day into two parts. The first is for my production assignment while the second is for rationalizations or for helping the comrades." He smiled. "My wife says that my head does not let my hands remain idle."

I looked at Bespalov's hands as he was handling some kind of attachment and, for the first time, noted how beautiful they were: Amazingly well proportioned, with wide palms and long strong fingers. Firm, flexible, displaying nervous energy, they seemed capable of materializing any kind of abstract thought. No such hands could be found among office workers or people engaged in heavy physical work. They were shaped and made beautiful by labor harmoniously combining spiritual with physical principles. Aleksey Ivanovich's entire appearance has been molded by precisely such work. Attentive and thoughtful eyes, literally weighing those around him, determining the true weight and value of everything. Evenly paced speech, enabling the others to master an idea, not to hear it but to master it. Imperceptible smooth movements which would not disturb the work process or environment, interrupt a thought, or distract.

Unhurriedly his hands were linking one part of an appliance to another while Bespalov went on:

"Had I been working on a piece-rate basis the plant would have had to pay me 700 to 800 rubles. But I am not a thief." He set the part aside. I would like you to understand why I left Levashov. He considers the overfulfillment of the plant as wanting more money. I can not complain that everyone had the same attitude toward me. They said that Bespalov is an innovator, a rationalizer." Aleksey Ivanovich became clearly excited. "Yet, what if even plan fulfillment work was not enough? This meant that I could have fulfilled two or three plans. Look at the instruments I work with." He picked up from the steel bench complex attachments. "This piece increases productivity 50-fold, while this one raises it 10-fold. What about my tables?"

He showed me two amazing books filled with even columns of figures. Digits alone covered 10 to 12 printed sheets.

"When I was at the institute a scientist asked me what computer I had used --a 'Minsk' or 'Ural'. I said nothing. The first edition was published when our industry did not even have a computer." He took the book away, leafed through it, and said:

"Slave labor work, such computations are, but I like them."

Our conversation was interrupted by a worker. Bespalov took the part he was holding and began to measure it with his instrument. I looked at Aleksey Ivanovich, thinking that he was not in the least the image of the withdrawn and, therefore, absentminded inventor. His tight bearing and firm features, high forehead, fast reaction to questions, and able resolution of situations were rather those of a military commander. People came to him for a price how to carry out a complex assignment. A worker-commander, a creative production spring. Was this not the type of worker we dream about? He was not an officially sounding commander. Regardless of how often our conversation was interrupted Bespalov was not annoyed. On the contrary, his eyes would become warm and his expression would soften.

Finally, left alone, he said:

"I can not work for myself alone with such equipment. A sensible balance is needed. We must take production interests into consideration. Today I helped the casting shop while yesterday I helped the comrades with fittings . . ."

Aleksey Ivanovich was no longer excited. What was exciting were his words, simple yet containing the highest possible morality. He could earn more but his dignity as a worker would not allow him. So, he began to help his comrades, the entire collective, for free.

True, who would pay Bespalov for the hours he had spent this day in the casting shop, finding the reason for a defect? The consultations he gave to his comrades would not affect his earnings in the least. Therefore, it was a question of selfless toil for society, for the future whose beginning was noted by Lenin who instructed us to support this with all our strength. The way moisture sinks in farmland to give the grain the strength to pierce the ground and turn into a fertile field, our society is gathering the energy of communist labor which transforms not only the country but man himself.

I recalled workers as great as Bespalov at the Moscow Marshalling Yard, the First Bearings Plant, the Plant imeni Likhachev, and the Kazakhstan Mine imeni Lenin . . . Such an enumeration may be unnecessary. I would think that today in nearly each enterprise you may come across great workers. This is characteristic of the times. Somehow, we are even no longer astounded by it. I looked at Aleksey Ivanovich who was putting his workplace in order and thought that there is trouble when amazement is replaced by indifference or lack of understanding . . .

The shift came to an end. The shop was emptying. Setting instruments in a case, Bespalov explained:

"I was asked by VOIR [All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalizers] to display my equipment in another plant."

He locked the case firmly and turned to me. His stern look softened.

"Do you know what I just thought about? The war. My younger brother and I were apprentices at the ZIS [Moscow Automobile Plant imeni Stalin]. The war was on so we studied less and worked more. Sometimes my brother and I slept on the joiner's bench. We would be so tired that we would hardly have the strength to walk to the machine tool. It was at that point, as though literally feeling the condition of the workers, that Likhachev would come to our shop. He would respectfully greet the brigade leader and discuss things. Then he would turn to us, to the lads. How are things, boys? He would shake his head and say, 'I realize, things are hard. It is hard at the front too. Be patient.' He would joke awhile. Yet, he had a thousand workers to deal with at the plant. Nevertheless, he found the time to cheer even us, the boys. That was Likhachev for you! Levashov, however, has only a few hundred workers. He would look right through us very well. Now I can well and plenty." Aleksey Ivanovich carefully lifted the case. "Shall we go?"

That is how I remember him. Walking down the shop after the working shift, starting the social shift, sharing the wisdom of his skill and the discoveries made through his talent.

I also remember the story told by shop chief Nikolay Georgiyevich Fedorov about Bespalov's goodness, his dedication and loyalty to the collective. Fedorov spoke about Aleksey Ivanovich with excitement and gratitude, and I totally lost any understanding of the other shop chief--Vladimir Petrovich Levashov--who could not be bothered to see that Bespalov had work and who had hurt him deeply. Yet, he should have understood . . .

One bright morning I went to the shop where Bespalov had worked until recently. Bright sunshine was pouring through the windows on the machine tools, the people, and the huge machine parts, casting gay spring colors. That was perhaps the reason for which the shop seemed orderly and unusual. Naturally, the sunshine was not the only pleasing thing. I had rarely seen such an abundance of new and complex equipment as here. Machine tools with digital programming covered the entire hall. A batch of machine units awaiting assembly stood in the center. The electronic control panels directing the manufacturing of parts blinked evenly.

Without bending over the machine tools or standing over them the entire shift, as is usually the case, the workers were sitting in comfortable chairs reading books. Occasionally they would change the program by replacing the punch card in the electronic equipment. Parts with the highest accuracy were coming out of the machine tools. I thought: Here is where

creativity is applied! A permanent harmony seemed to reign between man and equipment. However, this sensation disappeared with an idea which had been troubling me for the past few days and which had now become particularly worrisome. Why is it that precisely here, at the front end of technical progress, no position was found for such a great worker as Bespalov? Could it be that he was incompatible with the processes occurring here? Yet, I already knew that some of the machine tools here had been redesigned by Bespalov, for which reason they had become "smarter," and had raised labor productivity. Somewhere nearby Aleksey Ivanovich's workplace, famous for its perfection not only in this field, had been located . . .

Why is it that Bespalov found himself unnecessary? The only person to answer this question was shop chief Vladimir Petrovich Levashov.

Levashov was in conference. Sitting behind the long desk engineers and foremen were being issued assignments. The telephone rang. Levashov answered briefly and efficiently. He had a bright young round face and lively provocative eyes. Only the firm lower jaw bespoke of firmness of will and purposefulness. Clearing up current affairs, Vladimir Petrovich gaily asked:

"What does Bespalov want specifically? To come back?" Sincerely, without waiting for the answer, he said: "It would be a pleasure to have him back. There is work."

Yet, learning that Aleksey Ivanovich did not consider returning, downcastedly said:

"Well, he's making good money . . ."

In the bitter silence that followed I recalled Nikolay Georgiyevich Fedorov and his story on how he had hired Bespalov. "When Bespalov applied to us I told him immediately that we would be unable to match his previous salary immediately and wished to tell him why. But Aleksey Ivanovich saw standing me a casting. He picked it up, turned it around in his hands, saying, 'yes, your work is complex. Is it interesting?' Thus, we did not discuss earnings . . ." Obviously, money talk was of no interest to Bespalov. He was interested in the work . . .

Yet, Levashov pursued his train of thought:

"Before leaving, Aleksey Ivanovich should have discussed it with me. I could have told him where he could earn probably more than he is getting now."

Levashov began to enumerate places where one could earn well without particular trouble. I realized that he was totally unable to conceive that Bespalov may have other requirements. This blindness in assessing human behavior made me remember a meeting with Terentiy Semenovich Mal'tsev, a people's academician famous for his wisdom. We were at the edge of a huge field. Tractors were rumbling ahead. Terentiy Semenovich said thoughtfully:

"A peasant must not simply plow well. He must love the land he has plowed . . ."

He said that to love means to work not simply for money. It means to be happy and enthusiastic when the work goes well and be saddened when it does not, to suffer when it fails, to dream, and to link one's future with interesting work.

Such are the human passions that the concept of "need to work" contains. That was precisely why, moving to another plant, Besspalov spoke little of money.

Yet, Levashov discounted this. Straightening his shoulders, he said that he knew plant people better. He had a good argument.

"I am a worker myself. I could stand behind a machine tool now and show how one must work."

Indeed, Vladimir Petrovich began his career as a simple sling operator. After awhile, however, he found the work unsatisfactory. At that point he gave up decent earnings and enrolled in an institute. It was a hard row to tow before Levashov was able to find work consistent with his wishes. And even though today his salary is occasionally lower than that of a highly skilled worker, he is not complaining, involved as he is with his work.

Yet, the trouble is that now Vladimir Petrovich relates work bringing satisfaction only to promotions backed by a VUZ diploma or high wage. A career or money. Perhaps Levashov had failed to find his way not only in his relations with the workers but to learn about himself, about the source of pleasure from the work.

I was told the way, as a young engineer, cleverly, like an innovator, Levashov found solutions to difficult production situations. The memory of such decisions still makes him smile. They are his pride. Therefore, the happiness created by satisfactory work begins with creativity. Thanks to creativity man asserts himself in the world introducing something new, previously unknown. Creativity is a passion which could be satisfied only through the search of new designs, technologies, rhythms, models. . . . That is why Aleksey Ivanovich Besspalov makes something every day, invents, discovers, and writes books, even though he has no diploma and holds no high official position. Besspalov is a creative person. Shop foreman Uriy Timofeyevich Kretov said: "Besspalov has imagination. He can clearly see the thing he would like to do. He can imagine. This is a great ability."

In our century of drastically increased work complexity, the worker must be a creative person. Otherwise he would be unable to master electronic equipment or refined chemical production, or new technological processes. However, we have not as yet developed a way to check creative capabilities

and the need to work. So far these things are encouraged with no more than a certificate. It is far simpler, rejecting this entire facet of the work, difficult to determine, to rate the work in terms of rubles. That is what Levashov does. He looks at the payroll, leafs through the pages, indicating the high earnings of Bespalov and other workers.

"Look, look." He moved his fingers at random pointing at figures in excess of 500 rubles. "We can not ignore in the least material incentive. Practical experience has convinced me of this. Shop No 3 has already made a breakthrough."

Who could object to the fact that material incentive is one of the foundations of the economy? No one, naturally. The October Revolution proclaimed that "from each according to his capabilities and to each according to his work." In our society money is not a means for profit but a measure of labor and consumption. However, nor should we forget the first part of the principle asserted by the revolution: From each according to his capabilities. The implementation of this principle is of vital importance . . .

Our conversation has assumed a somewhat abstract nature. Vladimir Petrovich was arguing sluggishly, mostly nodding his head in agreement. People would look in, Levashov would raise his hand asking them to be patient. It was clear, however, that the time allotted for the conversation had expired.

I left the chief's office with an equivocal feeling, and went to the shop. Obviously, Levashov was a man dedicating everything to his work: He had already helped two shops achieve a breakthrough. Yet, at the same time, how could he have so insulted and easily parted with Bespalov who should have become his pillar of support in the collective? There was something else irritating in our conversation: Vladimir Petrovich had been gradually refuting truths which he would have probably emphasized in a speech to the collective. I could sense through his words scorn for the creative forces of the workers in general and Bespalov in particular.

Unexpectedly, the title "Diamonds in the Blood" distracted me from my thoughts. I saw the title on the dust jacket of the book reading by a young person running a machine tool with digital programming. I approached another youngster, seated comfortably, and saw that he too was plunged into a mystery novel. The idyllic feeling I experienced entering the shop disappeared. At first it seemed as though intensive and creative work was being done by the new modern machine tools, for their purpose was not only to upgrade labor productivity but relieve the workers from heavy routine operations, liberate the mind, and give scope to creativity. It was precisely for the sake of this that the country, that society are revolutionizing the production process. Here some kind of fraud was taking place, a blasphemy of thinking: Meaningless reading was being done.

Levashov passed by these youngsters with idling minds many times a day. Most of them were with secondary education and could have engaged in a more intellectual work than putting aside from time to time a mystery novel

and change the punch card in the electronic panel. Yet, Levashov walked by, even though he simply had to plan the type of organization of the work thanks to which everyone would become actively involved in the labor process. However, it happens in life that our shortcomings are frequently the extension of our virtues. The abilities which a production leader must possess --willpower, purposefulness, and ability to lead the people--suppress in Levashov equally necessary qualities: Be attentive to the people and be able to collect their opinions, knowledge, and experience. How frequently had Bespalov tried to discuss with Levashov how to improve the production process. He expected Vladimir Petrovich to welcome his advice. Yet, Levashov heard him on the run, without stopping, shaking his head in the negative. This had happened many times.

Aleksey Ivanovich spoke with bitterness of a particularly hurtful case. Bespalov was proud of his workplace. Justifiably so. It was famous throughout the entire oblast for its perfection. Once Aleksey Ivanovich suggested to Levashov that the entire area be made like his workplace: Paint the machine tools light green, equip them with new fittings, install tool storage shelves, and so on. This was no mere desire to embellish the shop. Bespalov's suggestion is described in sociological terminology as "application of the scientific organization of labor at the workplace." I had had the opportunity to note how in some plants such a measure had led to a 50 to 100 percent increase in labor productivity. This was a substantial reserve; yet, once again Levashov did not stop to listen, and once again shook his head negatively. This was yet one more occasion in which he rejected the worker's advice. Yet, the present change in industry is described as the scientific and technical revolution. Like in any revolution, it must involve the overwhelming majority of the people. A revolution has been and will remain a social phenomenon involving the participation of the broadest possible masses rather than a small elect circle. The millions of working people are the social base of the scientific and technical revolution.

Therefore, the scientific and technical revolution is not merely the installation of machine tools with digital programming or automated lines. It also means tremendous work with the people, their psychological tuning. It would be difficult to measure such a tuning with figures. It can be only sensed.

I talked to the workers, hearing the uncertainty their words expressed. Conversations between foremen and people were tense. Parts were in demand which, it turned out, had not been machined. The shift was nearing its end yet many operators would have to remain by their tools over-time

The vague feeling of concern developed into a clear feeling of alarm when Grigoriy Sergeyevich Tugin, shop party bureau secretary, and I began to read minutes of party meetings. The records of almost all meetings carry the words, "the plan is threatened!" The solution? "More frequent

over time." All such meetings are more like production than party meetings. The talk deals with equipment, instruments, and parts rather than the core of party work--problem of man. The secretary objected sharply:

"Production is the main thing in our work . . ."

He was literally unwilling or, perhaps, unable to understand that party work does not mean administrative activity but the ability, using party ways and means, to mobilize the human spirit, will, and creativity, focusing the attention on the people. This could be achieved through knowledge of the dialectics of the human soul rather than simply by citing the plan figures abundantly found in the bureau's reports.

It was as though shop party member meetings were prepared not by the party bureau but the administration. Naturally, it is good for the administrator and the party organizer to work in harmony, complementing one another. The trouble comes when one of them yields to the pressure of the second. This means that he is no longer capable of understanding the nature of his work and its characteristics, and no longer uses the methods inherent in it. In the majority of cases this is not done deliberately. That same Tugin is simply under the influence of Levashov's strong personality. He defended him heatedly and sincerely, failing to realize that he was thus defending his own errors.

"Levashov is reliable. He always aims at the target and hits it whatever the cost!"

Yet, why should the target be hit "at all cost?"

I spoke with the chief engineer, the deputy plant director, and the party committee secretary. All of them agreed that Levashov was a good specialist but rude.

As I met people I covered the almost entire plant territory. Unwittingly I thought of Bespalov following those paths in search of work, carrying parts from distant shops for study. These were minor items but, nevertheless, represented work so that he would not idle. "When my hands are not occupied I do not know what to do with them. They seem to be aching," Bespalov told me.

Returning to Levashov's office I heard his voice from a distance. A young stooped worker was sitting in front of Vladimir Petrovich, occasionally brushing off an invisible speck of dust from his fashionable jacket. Everything Levashov was telling him, as I gathered, was justified. However, the justice was concealed by the frightening hardness in the voice of the shop chief and the loud way in which he smacked his hand on the desk. The boy's eyes looked vacant. Automatically, monotonously he kept repeating "I will not, I will no longer . . ."

When the worker left Levashov looked at me still hot with indignation. His face no longer looked youthful. It was pale and wrinkles had appeared on both sides of his mouth. Ironically he asked:

"Well, was I rude?" Without awaiting the answer, he challenging said: "Everyone has his shortcomings. Mine is rudeness. Production work is not ballet!"

The aphorism was biting yet so obsolete . . . "it is not a ballet" . . . The point, precisely, is that today a production manager must appeal to the creative principle in man like a stage director. Rudeness is not simply a violation of ethics. It is incompatible with the humane laws of socialist production, for it puts out talent and oppresses the mind. Therefore, the enterprise managers were not correct by saying "Levashov is a good specialist but is rude." The two concepts are mutually exclusive. The prestige enjoyed by a rude manager is as brief as his shout. He easily loses the faith of the people. He no longer attracts but repels them. Beshpalov left. Others have left as well. Today the relatively small shop headed by Levashov is short of about 100 workers. Vladimir Petrovich and I looked at the list of recent resignations and Levashov was unable to find a good word for any one of them. Some of them might have been drunks or loafers . . . but not all!

"Naturally, it is difficult," Levashov said sadly. "But we shall make it. Initially it was difficult without Beshpalov. We are now doing without him too."

Vladimir Petrovich had not told me the entire truth. When particularly complex parts were received by the shop, he had to swallow his pride and turn to Beshpalov. Ignoring the insult, Beshpalov came and did what had to be done. Therefore, they did not do without him . . .

Naturally, however, it is not merely a matter of Beshpalov's professional skill. After a while another worker would reach the same level of skill. No one is irreplaceable. However, the loss will be felt by the collective for a long time, for it is a moral loss. Fedorov--the chief of the shop now employing Aleksey Ivanovich--told me that in the past, during their lunch break the young workers either played cards or simply chattered. Now they rally around Beshpalov and listen to his stories of trips around the country and meetings with friends--rationalizers in Sverdlovsk, Khar'kov, Novosibirsk, and Rostov who have developed skillful fittings and new working methods, or written books. Quietly the boys listen to Aleksey Ivanovich and then heap questions, become carried away, argue. Such is the interest in the work which Beshpalov awakens in their young souls.

Levashov should not repel through his inattention such great workers as Beshpalov but rely on them. It is precisely they who lead the collective, for they possess the great and valuable quality of an insatiable thirst for work. Anyone who falls within their creative gravity field becomes contaminated with the strength of innovation, looking at the production process differently, giving it a meaning and improving it.

Vladimir Petrovich Levashov reminds me of a 100 meter dash runner who can not afford to look at his competitors. His main purpose is to gain record setting fractions of a second. However, a manager is not a sprinter striving for an excellent result. His record lies in the victory of the entire collective. He must look around or, more accurately put, look at the people who work by his side. He must be able to approach individually everyone. He must be familiar with the mentality of the workers, the needs motivating them, their behavioral reasons, and the role of every member of the collective. He must know what he wants of those around him . . . Psychological knowledge is particularly important today, under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution, when old established technology is being restructured and when habitual labor processes are changing. Under such circumstances an understanding of the dialectics of the human soul makes it possible to develop talent and capabilities. From each according to his capabilities is no pious wish. It is a law of socialism. The creative participation of every worker in the scientific and technical revolution and the conversion of the performer into the transformer of the production process is a mandatory condition for the development of our society.

A manager who fails to understand the great power of labor in the gamut of the feelings of the worker hinders the production process. This was confirmed not only by the minutes of party meetings but the figures of the shop's plan fulfillment in their dynamics. Whereas with Levashov's advent the collective not simply made a breakthrough but began to overfulfill its plan, today it is barely keeping up with the monthly assignments. Is this not a decline and is such a decline so unexpected? It is not. Thoughtful managers have long noticed that the effectiveness of the material incentive is inversely proportional to its size. Therefore, the ruble is not infinitely powerful. Investing ever more money in material incentives and forgetting the spiritual content of labor, Levashov is achieving negative results. Scorn for the spiritual leads to yet another trouble: A consumerist attitude toward life which is expressed, specifically, in drunkenness. It is not accident that of late the number of violations of public order by intoxicated workers has increased sharply. Therefore, regardless of party bureau secretary Tugin's assertion, the objective can not be reached "at all cost." Other obstacles may be erected. . . .

My conversation with Levashov did not end on a happy note. Parting, he said seriously, no longer smiling:

"Perhaps Aleksey Ivanovich would nevertheless come back? There is work."

It is as though he expected of me to transmit this request to Bespalov. Obviously, Aleksey Ivanovich was quite needed by the shop and by Levashov himself. . . . However, I did not succeed in passing on the wish. Unfortunately, Bespalov died suddenly. As a journalist I could not immediately and easily tell this story. . . .

Bespalov died. Levashov is alive. The point is how. I have heard on several occasions Vladimir Petrovich described as an "efficient man." Yet, could a manager be considered "efficient" merely on the basis of a strictly pragmatic monetary approach to the richest phenomena in life? I immediately recalled Bespalov's story of Likhachev who measured labor not in terms of simple figures. He saw in labor a world of human feelings, emotions, joys, and disappointments. No other approach is possible, for any decision made by the manager is related not only to production but to the key social processes, to the molding of the personality of the man of the future. Pursuit of immediate advantages hinders Levashov to see the future. I know that a serious discussion was held at the plant's party committee session on his relations with the collective.*

. . . . Once again I see the hot casting shop where I met Bespalov. The red glow on the walls, the bubbling chaos of liquid metal, the molten stream heavily filling the mold. In an instant the metal becomes monolithic. However, if such fast instants may be stopped by the power of the mind one would see that in the blinding white chaos the offshoots of the monolith are born--crystallites. The metallurgists say that crystallites are born in unusual circumstances. I look at the range of colors of the hardening metal--blinding white, scarlet, blood red, dark red--and think of the unusual and talented nature of Aleksey Ivanovich Bespalov and of big workers like him around which collectives are already organizing along with the relations of our future, a future born today.

5003

CSO: 1802

* The events in this essay are real. However, the editors have considered it necessary to change first and last names.

"CODE OF HONOR" IN IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 35-46

[Article by Nikolay Proshunin]

[Text] Today respectful references to K. Marx may be found in monographs by bourgeois theoreticians and in the monopoly press. He is most piously recalled and zealously cited as a philosopher "belonging to the West." A general search for Marxian arguments may be noted in circles of university professors, among the most noisy fighters for "pure" democracy, and social reformist leaders and publicists. All of them, apparently, cite most favorably excerpts from Marx and display touching agreement with him. Many dyed in the wool anti-communists are willingly letting themselves be converted to Marxism, joining the host of newly converted "admirers" of his legacy. Valorous "Sovietologists" are openly smothering Marx in their forceful embraces.

The author of "Das Kapital," who had all reasons to say that his book was, unquestionably, the most terrible shell ever fired at the bourgeoisie; the inflexible proletarian revolutionary who earned, as V. I. Lenin said, the honorable hatred of opportunists and reformists; the great genius who was repeatedly anathemized and brought down from his pedestal--Karl Marx--is today surrounded by the flattering attention of the variegated crowd of bourgeois and bourgeois supporters, interpreters, and admirers. On the surface this phenomenon seems strange, almost unlikely. . . .

The Marxist-Leninist classics pointed out that each social system has its rules of life, customs, inclinations, and morality. Naturally, they have their idols, their "rulers of the minds." There was a time when a reference to Marx was considered by parlor socialists, reactionary philosophers, and vulgar economists a violation of the norms of proper bourgeois behavior. Joined by clan interests, and engaged in praising one another, they did not allow themselves to whisper even one word on his scientific merits. As F. Engels ironically pointed out in one of his letters, they "always cite their own rotten gang," or "authorities" of whom no one has ever heard (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 33, p 86).

Occasionally, some bourgeois figures would borrow from Marx but conceal the source of such borrowing. In his letters to Marx the British opportunist H. Hindman apologized to him for, while plagiarizing from "Das Kapital," he referred neither to the title nor its author as, allegedly, the English do not like to be instructed by foreigners; furthermore, they hated Marx's name greatly, and so on. Marx noted on the subject of such excuses that, without learning anything, the starry-eyed bourgeois writers would like to earn either money or political capital (see Vol 35, pp 202-203).

The reactionary scientists abstained both from acknowledging Marx's contribution to science and the public criticism of his work, realizing that abuse alone would be totally useless. Bitter experience convinced Marx that they would invariably conceal anything original in the best meaning of the term. The moment someone breaks out of the network of ossified thinking, he wrote, one could rest assured of a boycott. The policy of silence "is the only offensive weapon which the routine makers can use the moment there is interference" (ibid, p 127).

With the publication of the first volume of "Das Kapital," in the interest of science Marx and Engels deemed it desirable that polemics develop on the work as soon as possible in the specialized publications. However, sensing the danger of the book, the bourgeois economists did not wish even to mention it. "Das Kapital" was a challenge to official political economy whose ubiquitous situation was pitiful. The vulgar economists were unable to answer the challenge with any kind of serious argument. They concealed their painful silence behind an assumed scorn for "Das Kapital" as something totally unworthy of attention. Fear of the conclusions drawn in this work made them cautious. In the field of political economy they found it safest to have no political economy at all.

Naturally, the learned servants of the bourgeoisie could not allow themselves for long the luxury of totally ignoring Marx's works. Reality forced them to speak out and, subsequently, to start yelling. They all did their best to gain the honor of being "Marx's enemy," thus acquiring a substance! Any petty and insignificant individual desirous of drawing the attention of the bourgeoisie to his important personality and promote some publicity for himself would attack Marx, Engels wrote (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 37, p 8).

Today even the most ordinary book dealing with "Das Kapital" is circulated in the West as long as it represents, as the newspaper of the British communists has said, "an operation on Marx's heart" (MORNING STAR, Nov 17, 1977). Essentially, history is repeating itself.

Today Marxism is discussed on radio and television, in university lectures, and in thick theoretical journals. In West Germany alone, over 400 works on Marx and Engels were published from 1964 to 1967; 70 monographs and collections were published in 1971 and approximately another 115 in 1972.

Some bourgeois publications have tried to depict this as a "Marxian renaissance." In reality, this is a steady growth of Marxist-Leninist influence, stemming from the depth of past decades, and from the interest displayed in it throughout the world as well as, as a protective bourgeois reaction, as a multiplication of "Marxian" literature concealing the victorious march of communist ideas.

The official purpose of the "science of Marx" has been made fully clear in the course of the polemic between communist and capitalist ideologues. The bourgeois "investigation" of Marxism pursues, above all, the task of compromising existing socialism as the "abandonment" of Marxian ideas and as an attempt to turn Marx into a witness against socialist democracy, pitting his statements against Lenin's views and the policy of communist parties.

The tendency of bourgeois ideologues to assume the role of "orthodox" Marxian supporters becomes, consequently, not such a strange paradox. From the viewpoint of their class interests they are acting quite carefully. Marx is too important and, naturally, having him on their side would make the moral subordination of the working people easy and advantageous. As has always been the case in history, after the death of revolutionary leaders, their enemies have tried to use their names to mislead the masses. Wherever Marxism is popular among the workers, Lenin cautioned, the supporters of the bourgeoisie will "bow and swear with Marx's name." Hypocrisy has its eternal laws.

. . . .
But then I sigh, and with a piece of Scripture
Tell them that God bids us do good for evil.
And thus I clothe my naked villainy
With old odd ends stolen out of Holy Writ,
(Shakespeare, "Richard III")

The attempt of the bourgeois theoreticians to oppose factual socialism with Marx's help is not only play-acting but a symptom: Obviously, the reserves of bourgeois ideology have been drained off and efforts are being made to replenish them from this specific source.

The "last word" in anti-communism and bourgeois "Marxology," representing nothing new in terms of objectives, should have at least triggered some new methods for refuting Marxism-Leninism. Yet, despite the entire refinement of this anti-communist variant, it is similar to the old moldy ways. Unquestionably, it would be harmful to ignore the ideological rearming of the bourgeois enemy. However, neither is there a reason for exaggerating its methodological equipment. Constantly and inevitably the enemy falls into the old rut in his feverish attempts to find new means for undermining revolutionary theory. This is proved by comparing his tactics with frequent occurrences in the history of the conflict of ideas.

Over long periods of his life Marx was the subject of gross slander by his class enemies. People who launch a slander gain a temporary advantage, aware of the fact that "something may remain" of it. In such cases, Marx and Engels soberly assessed their disadvantageous position which was that they, personally, had to defend themselves and that they could not answer a lie with a lie. Convinced, however, that lies should not be given the freedom, particularly if they could cause harm to the labor movement itself, they courageously entered the battle and all their strikes accurately hit the targets. They never intended to fight slander with slander or promote false arguments to counter false arguments. "If one must fight, one must fight honestly" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 17, p 477). Hitting a slanderer such as, for example, "Mr. Vogt," Marx exposed him not as an isolated individual or personal enemy but as a representative of "an entire trend."

Today the ideologues of capitalism can no longer limit themselves to gross slander. The old fashioned criticism of Marxism, with its exaggerations, half-truths, and big lies has assumed the second line of defense. Naturally, the old methods have not been entirely discarded. Now, however, attempts are being made to give them a decent appearance.

What distinguishes civilization from barbarism, Fourier says, is that a simple lie is replaced by a complex one. A transformation from simple to complex bourgeois lie is occurring in the methods of fighting Marxism as well.

Today the bourgeois press is singing the praises of Marx the man, acknowledging him as an outstanding humanist and passionate fighter for freedom. However, the purpose is not to prove that Marx gave the struggle for freedom a scientific substantiation. The efforts are aimed at splitting Marx into two parts: On the one hand, the sincere and honest revolutionary worthy of respect, full of ideal thrusts; on the other, the scientist whose "utopia" of a classless society has been "buried in the catacombs of history." This is a repetition of attempts to kill Marxism through kindness, described by Lenin as the favorite method of bourgeois theoreticians, and attempts to present, by praising Marx's individual qualities, a distorted interpretation of his ideas, proclaiming the loss of their topical significance.

Today's "impartiality" of the bourgeois ideologues is precisely the same as the one mocked by Marx himself. The article by John Ray, a British bourgeois economist, on his views, crowded with errors, was presented as impartial. "Why 'impartial'?" Marx wrote. "Because John Ray does not claim that my 40 years of propaganda of fatal theories was guided by 'bad' motives. 'I praise his generosity!' As well as his 'impartiality' which consists of, at least, becoming sufficiently familiar with what one is criticizing which, apparently, is entirely inaccessible to the hacks of British philistinism" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 35, p 202).

Concealing behind false objectivity and impartiality, the bourgeois theoreticians are trying to "reinterpret" Marx's doctrine in such a way as to turn the revolutionary fighter into a benevolent liberal professor. This is accomplished through a simple pair of scissors: The living fabric of his works must be broken up into quotations and put together into something superficially similar yet without a soul. As a result of such a plunder of Marx it is hoped that one's own "Western" Marxism will result or even several "Marxisms" each one of which would represent no more than an ordinary and totally innocuous concept.

In his time Marx had to endure a great deal of all kinds of people willing to "use" his statements and criticism based on misquoted statements. They showed no reluctance to resort to a loose interpretation of his views thus gaining a better possibility to refute them or to defend with their help their own doubtful position. Some of them enjoyed such a rich imagination that they could not read a single line without finding diametrically opposite meanings. Misinterpreting most contradictorily individual sentences out of context, they draw on their basis entirely arbitrary conclusions. "Straightening out misquotations from 'Das Kapital' alone cited by these gentlemen, and putting them in quotes," Engels wrote, "would fill an entire volume" (ibid, p 123).

He bitingly characterized the methods used by one P. Bart: "His criticism of Marx is truly entertaining. He begins by structuring a materialistic theory of historical development the way, in his view, it should have been done by Marx and then discovers that in Marx's works matters are presented entirely differently. However, he, Bart, does not draw the conclusion that he has ascribed to Marx something erroneous but, adversely, draws the conclusion that Marx is contradicting himself and has been unable to apply his own theory! "Oh, if only these people could know how to read!" would Marx usually exclaim in connection with such criticism (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 38, p 109).

In this excerpt the name Bart could be fully substituted with the names of today's "Marxologists" who are interpreting and citing Marx in such a way as to make him say exactly the opposite of what he says. In their "reading" of Marx, their inability to interpret Marxism as an integral science is thickly interlaced with conflicting cheatings, forgeries, and fabrications. Dragging Marx in the direction of their claims, as a prisoner bound hand and foot, they ascribe to him views which have nothing in common with his convictions.

Some interpreters ascribe absolute significance to individual views which Marx formulated only as being relative, as accurate only under certain circumstances and within certain limits, thus converting them into abstract theses which could be schematically "superimposed" on any historical situation.

Others separate specific theoretical formulas from the totality of thoughts and facts on which they are based. This also offers a possibility for the arbitrary montage of citations, their one-sided interpretation, and hastiness with preconceived conclusions.

Others specialize in singling out various emphases which Marx, Engels, or Lenin used at different times in accordance with new priority tasks. Thus, frequently using a single sentence taken out of context and with no interdependence among ideas, they develop an entire army corps of arguments.

In their desire to cast aspersions on socialist democracy, such ideologues emphasize in Lenin's works only that which he said on the dictatorial aspect of the proletarian state system (mainly in the period of the fierce struggle waged by the Soviet people against the domestic and foreign counter-revolution), omitting vivid parts of the creative, constructive, and profoundly democratic nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat which helps to involve the working people in the administration of the state. By "sifting out flies but gobbling camels" (a British saying of Biblical origin), they put together statements against bureaucracy in order to cast aspersions on socialist reality as the "absolute rule of an omnipotent bureaucracy," and as a "retreat" from Lenin's true intent.

Incredibly stupid conclusions are drawn on the basis of individual phrases found in Marx and Lenin. R. Garaudy and G. Petrovic have gone so far as to interpret the remark found in "Philosophical Notebooks" that intelligent idealism is closer to Marxist philosophy than mechanical materialism . . . as Lenin's turn to idealism. "The young Lenin (in 'Materialism and Emperio-criticism') repeatedly tended to forget this," G. Petrovic writes. "The mature Lenin, however (in 'Philosophical Notebooks'), admitted his own error, pointing out that 'intelligent idealism is closer to intelligent materialism compared with stupid materialism.' We also find in the young Lenin the non-dialectical theory of reflection according to which our mind is merely the reflection of the outside world existing outside and independently of it. In his 'Philosophical Notebooks' the mature Lenin corrected this youthful sin as well" (see G. Petrovic, "Wider den autoritaren Marxismus" [Against Authoritarian Marxism], p 24). Naturally, all this big talk deserves no comment.

Such interpretation of texts have always been exposed by Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

Merciless toward any falsification of Marxist concepts, Lenin vigilantly watched cases of textually accurate yet one-sided citation and the eclectic interpretation of one or another general concept when applied to an individual case without a specific analysis of conditions surrounding that precise case. He pitted against such a misuse of citations the study of the basic ideas of Marx and Engels. In each separate case he analyzed the sum total of their views, correlating them. This is avoided by the "Marxologists," particularly in dealing with their correspondence, something

of great importance. "Letters," Engels noted, "are written from memory, quickly, without checking, and so on. An expression may always sneak in and taken up by anyone among those who, in our country, on the Rhine, is known as Korinthenscheisser (little wretch--the editor), who may draw out of it God knows what kind of nonsense" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol. 37, pp 421-422).

Clearing the main Marxist truths from opportunistic "dumps," Lenin explained the ways these basic concepts developed and the way they inevitably stem from all the works of Marx and Engels, and the way they are being confirmed to an ever greater extent by life, the development of science, and the experience of the labor movement in all countries. This method deprives the enemy of the possibility to surround himself with quotations applicable to different situations or taken out of historical context.

The struggle which Lenin waged against rude literary manners was a struggle for the purity of theory, the accurate interpretation of social phenomena, and a principled honest discussion. Vladimir Il'ich forgave no one tricks and forgeries involving citations or attempts to read in a text something which is neither present nor could be present, or turning statements around, when the deletion of individual words blunts the sharpness of essential facts, or when arbitrary curtailments of formulations are made. In his pamphlet "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky" Lenin repeatedly pointed out Kautsky's misquotes and the "agile" way in which he falsified Marxism, distorting, rejecting, or deleting Marx's statements "unpleasant" to the bourgeoisie. Lenin described all this as a swindle, as a "scientific" work resembling a forgery more than anything else.

Limiting oneself to the extraction of bits, citing one part of a definition and forgetting the other, and breaking a thought in the middle, "begging your pardon," Lenin said, "is an inadmissible way to quote" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 42, pp 256-258). This type of quoting repelled him as an unworthy and pitiful method used in the exercise of trite wit, to mislead the reader, and win easy "victories."

The principles developed by Marx, Engels, and Lenin in the study of literature hostile to communism and polemic standards include demands such as provability, literary and theoretical conscientiousness, and the substantive analysis of controversial matters. These were their standards in the fields of proper citing. It is equally important today as well to consider carefully the way they exposed inadmissible methods and the skill, irrefutability, and meaningful way in which they themselves used citations.

Proper citations consistent with scientific and overall cultural requirements mean, above all, impeccable accuracy in repeating someone else's words. This is one of the most important norms of the literary "code of honor" (Engels). Lenin's advice is well-known: We must not give the enemy arms by misinterpreting him! We could provide our opponents with trumps not only as a result of erroneous critical descriptions of views we oppose but also through erroneous "positive" quotations. Many historical examples to this effect could be cited.

Exposing in the Reichstag the policy of the Centrist Catholic Party, citing as proof that the church has always encouraged slavery, K. Frome, a social democratic deputy, quoted from Thomas Aquinas. In a rebuttal, a centrist party deputy claimed that Frome's citation came not from Thomas Aquinas but Aristotle. Thus Frome's speech was used as a pretext for victorious claims by his opponents and, in Engels' view, the story involving Thomas Aquinas and Aristotle should have been thoroughly researched; if an error had indeed been made "it meant that Frome was unable to use a citation; in the opposite case he should have been able to regain his reputation with a statement on the subject" (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 39, p 23).

The art of impeccable citing, from the viewpoint of scientific ethics, is a manifestation of the cultural level at which a variety of printed sources are assimilated, a broad view, and the ability to identify the nature of various phenomena. On the one hand, such citations confirm the principled-mindedness and moral loftiness of their user, his self-exactingness, respect for and faith in the independent judgment of the reader, awareness of his rightness and strength, and his responsible attitude toward the printed word; on the other, this is an indicator of political maturity and ability to formulate accurately a controversial problem, and bring to the surface the real nerve, the core of the conflict. Under such conditions quoting is a means for persuasion and an attack weapon.

Quotations and facts are both stubborn matters. They could hit us quite painfully. On what occasion, though?

In the Constituent Manifesto of the First International Marx cited (and then repeated in "Das Kapital") a sentence from the speech delivered in the House of Commons by Gladstone, the British chancellor of the exchequer. Praising the unusual growth of the country's wealth, he made the following fatal admission: "Such a dizzying growth of wealth and power is totally restricted to the rich classes." In his article "How to Quote from Karl Marx," the bourgeois ideologue L. Brentano claimed that no such statement may be found in the chancellor's speech and that the author of the Manifesto had "formally and basically invented this sentence." This slanderous article provided the impetus for a fierce long dispute.

Marx victoriously refuted the falsification charge, proving, on the basis of reports carried by a number of bourgeois newspapers, published simultaneously and independently, that Gladstone's uncautious statement, describing the capitalist system and compromising his own person as chancellor of the exchequer, had indeed been made. The statement ascribed by Gladstone was carried at that time by the entire London press. It was only subsequently that it was sensibly deleted by Gladstone himself in the parliamentary publication he controlled.

Intoxicated by his imaginary triumph, Brentano described his charge as "severe, totally destructive." Blabbing out, he stated that this sentence in Gladstone's speech was the most provocative part of the Constituent

Manifesto, that thanks to the Manifesto it had become famous, and that Marx had used it as a denunciation of the rich to the poor the world over. The exploiters were mortally insulted! This was the reason for Brentano's particular irritation and helpless fury, having thus unwittingly acknowledged the fact that the Manifesto represented a brilliant defense of the interests of the working class.

Lenin's quotes were just as powerfully convincing. For example, citing the admission of a reactionary newspaper which revealed the true objective of the foreign bourgeoisie which stated that, "we are going into Russia in order to break the power of the Bolsheviks," he considered as unquestionable "the importance of this short quote which to us sounds like a call to revolution, like the most powerful revolutionary appeal . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 37, p 166).

K. Marx, F. Engels, and V. I. Lenin were intolerant of petty, "literal," criticism and petty polemics. They scorned all pettifoggery and trivial catches which raged around slips of the pen or inept turns of phrases. On the contrary, the bourgeois ideologues and propagandists usually give priority to sensation triggering trifles and insignificant details in order to draw attention away from main problems by delving into petty matters and conceal the flaws of their positions. Engels repeatedly drew attention to this method used by the enemies of Marxism: " . . . Since what they consider most important is to confuse the main problem, we should do everything possible to provide them with a reason for doing so; we should answer all questions of secondary importance they ask as briefly and sharply as possible in order to eliminate them immediately; we ourselves must try to avoid any asides and secondary matters however tempting they might be. Otherwise, the area covered by the discussion would become broader and broader and the initial point of the debate would vanish further and further. At that point any decisive victory would become impossible. . . ." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 38, pp 348-349).

An example of the strict observance of this rule is Engels' polemical pamphlet entitled "Brentano Contra Marx. On the Subject of Alleged Falsification of a Quote. History of the Matter and Documents." In the pamphlet Engels rejected everything unrelated to the matter of the falsification of the quote and, using a tremendous amount of data, proved the impeccable literary and scientific conscientiousness of the author of "Das Kapital." The fact, he concludes, that among the many thousands of quotes taken from Marx's words the bourgeois ideologues have fastened themselves, like leeches, on a single quote, is proof that they are perfectly aware of "the way Karl Marx quotes," i.e., of the fact that he quotes accurately.

Accurate quotes are the "material fabric" of polemics which is the necessary base in the process of proofs and rebuttals. Naturally, hardly anyone would undertake to formulate a rule covering all cases to regulate the choice of statements, their number, and their expedient use. Data are gathered and used according to individual concepts. "What would be considered

unimportant by some--for its own sake or for the purpose of the quote, may be considered important and decisive by someone else," Engels wrote (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 22, p 117).

Lenin defined the problem of quoting through the following formula: If you want to know your enemy you must go into his country. You must gain first-hand knowledge of his customs, mores, and thinking and acting methods.

Excerpts made by Lenin are always eloquent documents exposing the mediocrity of theoretical postulates and weaknesses in the arguments of the enemies, their quasi-scientific clowning, and unacceptability of weapons. Analyzing them, Lenin provides the reader with rich data for an objective consideration of the positions held by the sides and the opportunity to draw from the direct confrontation of initial viewpoints and arguments a convincing solution in favor of Marxist views.

A number of Lenin's articles are based on critical analysis of a single short excerpt which, however, immediately leads to the core of the matter, clearly showing typical prejudices. Sometimes a single word, not accidentally mentioned, a single term could illuminate, like a flash of lightning, the principal content of a specific doctrine or line of political behavior. Lenin sharply noted such "slips" as minor manifestations of important trends. Vladimir Il'ich would quote excerpts but would study the problem not on the basis of separate statements but in its entirety. It was precisely this that enabled him to find the most important features of refuted theories. We see that frequently a minor illustration, as he pointed out, "suffices to the eye."

Initiating an argument, the founders of Marxism would read everything written on the question, however long this would require. Engels believed that whatever is worth doing is worth doing properly. He weighed in advance whether or not a book was worth criticizing or let it "die a natural death." On some works Engels rudely remarked that "judging by their titles alone they would be good as toilet paper only." In his words, anyone who failed to be strictly selective in choosing pamphlets and books would be fabricating literature about literature and on the subject of literature. People engaged in such craft "naturally, produce more publications in the course of the year than those who would like to learn something and write about books only if: 1. They have studied them and 2. If they contain anything worthwhile" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 36, p 153).

Neither Marx nor Engels seriously argued with ignorant and conceited people who would raise their squeaky voices against the communists. They mocked them, making them appear stupid, turning their own words against them. Engels gave some time to the opportunists who joined in attacks against Marxism without making themselves entirely clear to show their true face. He did not prevent them from exposing themselves, believing that "a purely defensive tactic used against such people is the best until they themselves overstep the mark" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 38, p 349).

Arguing with babblers without influence would trigger an empty squabble in the hope that it could awaken public interest in them and would only enhance their prestige. Lenin advised against arguing with such people, analyzing their foolish suggestions and enabling them to draw the attention from important to unimportant matters.

Marx, Engels, and Lenin cautioned against a way of arguing in which an effort is made simply to ignore all the claims of the other side without a consideration of their essence: If the opponent has said "yes," the believed sacred duty is immediately to say "no." Anyone who, in ignorance, says "white" only because someone else has had "black" is simply following the rule set by his opponent, revealing not the independence of his own judgment but, conversely, his dependence on the opponent, yielding to the temptation of a too easy solution. "On many occasions," Lenin wrote, "we have had Bolsheviks . . . who has argued against Martov precisely when Martov had been right! God save us from such 'allies'!" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 30, p 106). The classics of Marxism-Leninism followed the rule of admitting the good aspects of their opponents. In this respect Marx was inordinately generous and just, conscientiously quoting anyone "who would contribute even a small drop to progress" in the sciences. Lenin as well gave his due to anyone even though he may have been an ideological adversary, for a conscientious search for the truth. He highly valued people with a fearless judgment, principle-mindedness, dignity, and nobility in the struggle and showed chivalrous courtesy toward an opponent in whose views he found a healthy kernel. He preferred opponents who stated clearly and openly what they wanted and engaged in open battle in defense of their convictions. Lenin emphasized the need to argue sharply with a purposeful, consistent convinced enemy, using disgusting and unworthy methods which, nevertheless, should be paid attention to. Marked by scientific objectivity, Lenin's criticism is accepted in full, and has the irresistible power of truth.

In a number of cases Marx's and Lenin's approach to the study of someone's sermon is based on making clear the unclear. Exposing the subterfuges of bourgeois leaders, sophists, and pseudo-revolutionaries, who use their tongues as a means for concealing their thoughts, they mercilessly rejected verbal garbage, exposing what was concealed under the piles of vague twists and all kinds of inuendos and omissions hidden behind the shining tinsel of "democratic" phraseology. The translation of confused views from fanciful, unclear, and hypocritical into simple and clear language understood by the masses makes it possible to determine the essence of harmful views concealed by verbiage and by a ponderous and labored style which obscures important theoretical and political problems.

Translating unintelligible blabberings of bourgeois doctrinaires into common human language, in his article "Political Indifference" Marx expresses what they say: "The working class should not become organized in a political party . . . should instead of a bourgeois dictatorship the workers organize their own revolutionary dictatorship they would commit a horrible crime against principles, for . . . in order to crush the resistance of

the bourgeoisie the workers would give the state a revolutionary transitional form rather than laying down their arms and abolish the state . . ." Marx puts in quotes two pages of such recommendations, after which he states: There is no doubt whatever that if the preachers of political indifference would speak with such clarity the working class would consider such speeches as insults and would send such advisors "to hell" (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 18, pp 296-298).

Actually, this article could be used as a good textbook in the circles for the political education of "Marxologists" whose narrow interpretations fail to reflect Marx's sharp and precise statements on the need for a workers' party, proletarian dictatorship, a strong proletarian state, and all-round defense of the gains of the revolution.

The interpretation of Marx's and Engels' views on the party would be a typical example of a metaphysical and eclectic approach. The deep thought that the liberation of the working class must be accomplished by the working class itself is the basis for claims that Marx did not even think of the need for the party's leadership of the masses. His words on the party, taken out of the context of his letter, are used as an attempt to prove, "in a great historical meaning," that to be "in one's heart" on the side of a certain ideological current is, allegedly, "according to Marx" a sufficient characteristic of belonging to a "party."

Here, to begin with, the "Marxologists" conceal the fact that the founders of scientific communism used this concept in the broad meaning of the term as well, when the term of "proletarian party" covered the entire huge political camp of the labor movement, as well as in the strict meaning of the term, when speaking of the "communist party" precisely as the leading segment of the proletariat. Secondly, they ignore facts of Marx's and Engels' biography and their militant participation in the organized labor movement, and their tireless activities in the International, aimed at the creation and strengthening in all countries of independent parties equipped with the theory of scientific communism. Marx's biography can not be complete without including such activities, since, as Engels emphasized, Marx's life without the International "would be like a diamond ring without the diamond" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 36, p 38). Finally, people who fabricate "Marxist arguments" in the field of party problems, keep under wraps Marx's and Engels' direct statements that the proletariat needs its own revolutionary class party in order to defeat the bourgeoisie.

The misinterpretation of Marx's and Engels' views on the party was needed by "Marxologists" such as the double-dyed American anti-communist Bertram D. Wolff, the Jesuit priest Gustaf A. Wetter who, as early as the 1950's, noisily proclaimed his existence with the pretentious book entitled "Refutation of Dialectical Materialism," Klaus Westen, the author of the anti-communist work "The Leading Role of the Communist Party in the Socialist State," published in the FRG, and others like them, to pit the democratic view of the party, shared by the founders of Marxism, against Lenin's alleged

dictatorial views, and present Marx and Engels as supporters of an organization "open to all," without a single program or discipline, and without the subordination of the minority to the majority, a subordination which, it is alleged, means the suppression of all initiative. The professional anti-communists are calling upon the world's communist and workers' movements to take "the path back to Marx" (K. Westen). The French bourgeois sociologist M. Duverger proclaims that "types of organization other than the Leninist are needed. Socialism should invent something different if it wishes to be democratic" (M. Duverger, "Lettre ouverte aux socialistes" [Open Letter to the Socialists], Paris, 1976, p 54). Naturally, the bourgeois ideologues are not concerned in the least about turning anyone "back to Marx." They are hoping to induce the Marxist-Leninist parties to go back to the 19th Century, and to the old "model" of the amorphous reformist organizations of the Second International which were incapable of revolutionary action. The communists are answering such false tutorship the way Lenin answered the false friends of the working class: "Why are you trying to be cunning . . . you need not a vanguard party but a rearguard party which would make the upsurge harder. You should state so openly!" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 14, p 163).

The urgent bourgeois need to emasculate the scientific and revolutionary content of Marx's doctrine is satisfied by revisionist and other muddle-heads. Their writings are a favorite dish to the bourgeois ideologues who take up with particular willingness anything which might contribute to the development of a version of a "pluralistic" Marxism.

As a rule, the various "interpretations" of Marx's works involve attempts to break into parts the integral Marxist-Leninist doctrine, erect a wall between Marx and Lenin, and depict Leninism as merely the "Russian" or "Eastern" Marxist variant. Therefore, to the extent to which a "Russian variant" exists, a "domestic" Marxism would be possible on another national soil or, simply stated, Marxism without Leninism. As we know, the infamous Austrian revisionist E. Fischer, while rejecting the integral existence of Marxism-Leninism, put this scientific term in "ironical" quotes. Today the people engaged in deleting from the political dictionary the concept of "Marxism-Leninism" would like to consider themselves "non-dogmatic" Marxists. These are the same "vainglorious leaders" who, as Fidel Castro recently said, addressing a mass meeting in Santiago de Cuba, "are trying to nationalize Marxism, to make it chauvinistic, to put themselves above Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and who scorn the accuracy and depth of research." The Marxists-Leninists reject ideological compromises, nationalism, and chauvinism. ". . . We state," Rodney Arismendi writes, "that we are unable to understand and consider dangerous the fine distinction occasionally made between references to the thoughts of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and the rejection of the political and philosophical categories expressed by such thoughts . . . It seems even more dangerous, both in terms of essence and theoretical and political consequences, to refer to Marxism and reject Leninism" (ZA RUBEZHOM, No 17, 1978). Indeed, it is difficult to understand how people who proclaim themselves supporters of Marx exclusively (as though today true Marxism would be possible without Leninism!) could most seriously assert that they are "saving the honor" of the consistent and "original" Marxism!

In the past as well Marx has had a large number of "followers" distinguished by their clear lack of understanding of the outlook which they supported, distorting it to a point beyond recognition. It was precisely they who made it possible for Marx to say that in such a case he himself would not be a "Marxist." These dangerous "friends" offered the enemy the sought-after grounds for attacking revolutionary theory, relieving them of the need to refute the books written by Marx himself. Naturally, it was both handier and easier to deal with topics debasing Marxist science, bypassing Marx. Whenever it became necessary to oppose the International, the reaction always attacked the Bakuninists with their meaningless and blatant phrase-mongering. In turn, Bakunin held Marx and Engels responsible for each thoughtless word either expressed or written by any of their immature students.

The method is quite unprincipled, for it is quite clear that the main feature of an honest conflict of ideas are the concepts rather than the way they are presented by one or another offer. Neither the theory nor its originators are to be blamed in the least for the errors of people identifying themselves as "Marxists." This has been always well-known by the bourgeois ideologues. However, identifying Marxism with its caricature has remained their favorite weapon. Marx displayed no tendency to underestimate the insidiousness of this enemy method capable of causing indirect harm. Whenever one of the unlucky interpreters earns deserved ridicule, "the rotten apples and eggs hurled at him," he wrote, "could hit your own head and stain the party!" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 31, p 469). The fact that today an excessively coarse caricature may be replaced by relatively refined forgeries of Marxism does not change matters very much. The closer the likeness between a monkey and a man is the uglier the monkey seems.

The operations on Marxism performed by its latest misinterpreters meet with the unconcealed sympathy of the bourgeoisie. Whereas previously it supported the "critics," today the "real" experts are fashionable as they pursue the glory of restorers of the "authentic" Marx. Each one of them presents his deviations from Marxism as "real" Marxism. Indeed, to use Marx's and Engels' expression, "the viewpoints of such interpreters are as numerous as themselves." Inventing their own separate Marxism, they undertake to tell the communists, with a certain conceit, "what was it that Marx really said," drawing up lists of quotes "hard" to find in the publications of Soviet authors or the press of the fraternal parties.

There is no copyright protecting Marx's quotes. The bourgeois ideologues and those who have broken with Marxism have misinterpreted and will misinterpret them, using them as arguments; they will not cease their efforts to smuggle their ideological goods under a foreign flag. It is as impossible to prevent them from doing this, Lenin noted, as it would be to prevent a company from using a specific label, shingle, or advertising. Naturally, the use of persuasion is equally impossible. For example, when the Maoists ascribe to the Soviet Union statements made by Marx, Engels, and Lenin on the policy of Tsarism, any hope to shame them would be vain. People who take the highway of literary robbery with a bludgeon in their

hands know perfectly well why. In such cases Lenin called upon the party publicists not to blame, persuade, or pity them, but to attack them, to condemn "baseness and poison," and to master the art of exposing the contemptible methods of the vulgarizers of Marxism and its open enemies. The best training for this, as he wrote, is "melancholy," yet necessary work--Lenin's polemics and publicistic work.

The capitalist ideologues who are trying to use Marx's prestige against Marxism-Leninism are, in fact, taking theoretical polemics to the level of regular "psychological warfare."

The Marxists-Leninists do not fear the direct and open confrontation of ideas or outlooks. The ideas of socialism and capitalist ideology are irreconcilable and the inevitable struggle between them will continue. "Yet," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said, "we oppose turning ideology into the housemaid of military staffs and the ideological struggle into psychological warfare. Our principle is peaceful and honest competition of ideas and of social practices."

For the communists to quote the founders of Marxism-Leninism means to involve the highest achievements of today's revolutionary thought into the burning problems of the contemporary anti-imperialist struggle. Naturally, this makes the defenders of the bourgeoisie nervous and disturbs their intellectual comfort. Unable to find effective arguments, they try to interpret important scientific concepts as a certain "dogmatic fetishism" of the Marxist "catechism." However, this is merely a lame excuse disclosing helplessness in the conflict of principles.

In the honest competition between ideas we have on our side the truth of life and power of scientific arguments. Marx's prestige, the prestige of his great cause which lives and conquers is on the side of the communists, of all fighters for peace and social progress. The powerful theoretical weapon, "all 100 volumes" of the immortal works hammered out by Marx, Engels, and Lenin are on the side of those fighting for freedom and human dignity and for the ideals of communism.

5003

CSO: 1802

SOCIALIST POLITICAL ECONOMY: ORIGINS AND PROBLEMS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 47-58

[Article by G. Kozlov, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member]

[Text] The victory of the October Revolution faced the Leninist party with a big and entirely new problem: To provide a scientific substantiation of the practical ways for the building of a socialist society and, above all, of its economic base, thus theoretically arming the working people in the course of their constructive activities. For the first time in history they were asked to convert to a new production method consciously, on the basis of a drafted plan. V. I. Lenin gave the answers to the questions raised by life and revolutionary practice under the new historical circumstances.

Summing up the experience of the first years of socialist building in our country, Lenin profoundly and scientifically substantiated the party's economic strategy, the strategy for the victory of socialism. He expressed his fundamental ideas and theoretical solutions of basic problems of building socialism and communism in a number of works written in connection with the specific tasks of revolutionary practice on the eve of the October Revolution and in the first years of the Soviet system. These Leninist works provide an efficient system of ideas and an integral theory on the ways to build a new society. On the basis of the solid foundations of economic theory and scientific communism and the works of K. Marx and F. Engels, V. I. Lenin developed and concretized their initial concepts of socialist economic theory and laid the foundations of a new branch of Marxist economic science--socialist political economy.

Invariably guided by Lenin's economic theory in shaping the economic base of socialism, our party creatively applied and developed it on the basis of summed up historical experience. This was specifically manifested in the program decisions and party documents determining its economic strategy and tactic at each stage in the development of the Soviet society. They reflect the collective experience of the CPSU and the results of the elaboration of a theory, representing the true achievements of economic science and demonstrating the inseparable link between theory and the practical tasks of the building of communism.

I.

The tremendous step forward taken by Marxist political economy in Lenin's works is linked, above all, with the fact that he creatively enriched the method of dialectical materialism. The principle of historicism and its brilliant application in socialist economic theory, the elaboration of the problem of the role of practice in knowledge and in the ratio between the objective and the subjective, and of economics and politics in the building of socialism, and the substantiation of the need for all-round analysis of studied processes in their integrity and interaction, extensively developed by Lenin, are of particular importance.

Considering the new system a historically necessary level of economic progress of society, a progress which began with the seizure of the state power by the working class and the revolutionary substitution of private ownership of productive capital with public ownership, Lenin defined the ways for the development of production forces, and for their reaching a level needed for the victory of socialism. He clarified the basic features of its material and technical base and substantiated the inseparable link between planned economic development and the implementation of technical progress and between centralized planning and broad local economic initiative. He discovered the principles of the socialist organization of labor, and a historically entirely new form of competition based on comradely cooperation and mutual aid among people free from exploitation. He scientifically predicted the ways for the growth of socialist into communist labor and substantiated the objective need and possibility for achieving a level of labor productivity higher than under capitalism.

Lenin adopted a specific historical approach to determining the conditions for the victory of socialism in the countryside. He convincingly proved that cooperativism which, under capitalism, was a type of capitalist enterprise, assumes a socialist nature in both form and content when power is in the hands of the proletariat and with a national ownership of productive capital. Lenin's famous cooperative plan was formulated precisely on this theoretical premise.

The dialectics of development of new economic forms, discovered by Lenin, is of tremendous importance. He emphasized that, as in its entire historical creativity, here as well the proletariat borrows its weapons from capitalism, instead of "inventing them" or "creating something from nothing." Socialism is based on large-scale machine output and the task is to master and rework all that capitalism developed in this area. Answering those who saw merely the old content in the old economic forms used under the new conditions, at the 11th Party Congress Lenin pointed out that, "I claim that this is scholasticism . . . things have developed differently . . . in a way no Marxist could predict. There is no need to look back" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 45, p 117). These were the positions adopted by Lenin in his new approach to the problem of market-monetary relations. At the beginning of the Revolution, as Lenin pointed out, "we did not raise at

all the question of the correlation between our economy and the market or trade" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 44, p 199). It was reality that formulated this problem when the New Economic Policy was introduced. For the first time in Marxist science Lenin substantiated the need for market-monetary relations with their qualitatively changed new content under the conditions of the establishment of a planned socialist economy.

Lenin's use of the principle of historicism was equally manifested in his elaboration of the foundations of the scientific time breakdown of the socialist society, a breakdown which he related to the objective process of the gradual ripening of basic communist features. He predicted a stage in which socialism will reach full maturity in socioeconomic development. The Communist Party has been steadily guided by the Leninist principle of a historical approach to the formulation and solution of problems of communist construction at each of its stages, comprehensively defining and taking into consideration a historical position of a given stage, as well as specific conditions and characteristics.

The 24th and 25th Party Congresses made a new major contribution to the creative development of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of socialism. The Marxist-Leninist analysis methodology was systematically applied and developed in the reports submitted by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and in the other congress documents. The use of the historicism principle, the summation of the practical experience of the party and the achievements of progressive science and a comprehensive study ensured the profound characterization of the stage of developed socialism, making it possible to determine its historical position as a natural link in the development of the communist system. The congress decisions provided a basis for understanding the main criterion of the developed socialist society and for a truly scientific division into periods of the establishment of communism.

The systematic use by the Communist Party of the principle of historicism in the study of the socialist economy is a real achievement in economic theory and a further creative development of Marxist-Leninist methodology. It offers proper weapons to our scientists. In our view, the task of the science of economics is not only to formulate a system of categories characterizing the functioning of a specific production method but of revealing the historical trends and corresponding development stages. The study of the functioning of the socialist economic system should be most closely linked with a study of its progress. This is one of the most important foundations of the connection between theory and practice and the need for a scientific prediction of the course of development and planned management of socialist social production.

The insufficient use of the principle of historicism in economic science works or its reduction to a simple description of the process of the establishment of the socialist economy may be partially explained by the fact that the historical approach was not organically linked with the method of rising from the abstract to the concrete or else was identified with the

latter. The question of the unity between the logical and the historical, in our view, has still not been provided with an adequate solution in the scientific works on socialist political economy.

In the theoretical analysis of the economic system the movement from the abstract to the concrete frequently establishes transitions from simpler to more complex relations without, however, necessarily reflecting the process of historical development. For example, when essential relations are initially considered, followed by their forms of manifestation, this is not to say that a content exists initially, before and independently of any form. In the course of the historical process manifestations of a given essence not only change and become enriched but the very essence develops. Therefore, the movement from the abstract to the concrete is neither self-seeking nor does it replace the historical approach. On the contrary, it mandatorily presumes such an approach.

In history the ratio between the simple and the complex is a dialectical process characterized at the ascension from simple to more complex relations and the development of simpler into more complex relations. Marx wrote that "even though a simpler category may have historically existed previously in a more concrete aspect, in its full intensive and extensive development it may be found precisely in a more complex social form, whereas a more concrete category may have been less developed in a less developed social system" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 12, p 729). This means that even most abstract categories are products of historical conditions. Typical of capitalism is the movement from simple to complex relations (for example, from a commodity to a system of financial capital. However, this is not a rectilinear process or a logical structure typical of all systems.

Communism is a higher level compared with all previous historical levels of social development. At this stage the total socialization of production is achieved and the vestiges of socioeconomic contradictions inherited from the old society are eliminated entirely. The development of nationwide cooperation of labor on a communist basis is a conversion to a more complex form in which all the elements of the social organism are closely linked within a single entity free from antagonistic contradictions. Meanwhile, the complex social forms which were the result of the spontaneous development of relations under previous production methods and their promotion into a fetish, are gradually eliminated. For example, replacing market turnover with direct bartering is a movement from complex to simpler relations expressing the nature and objective of social production not circuitously (through the market mechanism) but directly. As a whole, the development of communism is a characteristic dialectical process of conversion to more complex social relations. However, this process also contains a movement from complex to simpler forms.

Consequently, the method of rising from the abstract to the concrete is of scientific importance in political economy only if it reflects a true movement, is subordinated to the historical approach, and is combined with them. This is precisely the root of the link between the knowledge of the objective laws governing the socialist economy and the practice of its planned development.

II.

Profoundly elaborating the problem of the ratio between the objective and the subjective factors in the building of a socialist economy, Lenin defended the Marxist view that development of all production methods without exception represents a legitimate natural-historical process and that, consequently, objective economic laws operate at all levels of development of human society, including socialism. Yet, Lenin extensively proved the constructive role played by the working people in the socialist revolution. He scientifically substantiated the need for a conscious consideration of objective economic laws and their application in a plannedly coordinated constructive activity of the masses. This is inseparately linked with the ratio between economics and politics and the leading role of the Communist Party. Lenin comprehensively interpreted the economic significance of the socialist state.

Formulating the concept of the primacy of politics over economics, Lenin did not have in the least in mind making politics the base. He considered politics the concentrated expression of scientifically understood basic interests of the classes and the interests themselves as an expression of specific economic conditions. Therefore, the successful use of economic laws with all their interrelationships and within their entire complex premises, above all, a proper political approach to the solution of economic problems. In the final account, the party's economic policy is determined by the objective need to create a communist society. This fully coincides with the interests of the entire people.

The party's creative approach to economic theory and to the study of the socialist system has already made it possible, under the conditions of the transitional period, scientifically to determine a number of substantial laws governing the building of a planned economy. The publication of Lenin's remarks on Bukharin's book "Ekonomika Perekhodnogo Perioda" [Economics of the Transitional Period], in 1929, the deeper study of Lenin's works written in the course of the struggle against various opposition movements, and daily economic management practice necessarily led our theoretical cadres to the understanding that the process of socialist development is based on the effect of objective economic laws. The party's documents reflect a number of objective dependencies such as, for example, between the level of wages and labor productivity, between production costs and accumulation, between accumulation and consumption, and between industry and agriculture.

Laying the foundations of the socialist economy and establishing the undivided domination of socialist production relations placed on the agenda a number of new problems such as the kolkhoz form of ownership and its future development, and the objectively established mechanism of socialist economic management. The nature of self-financing as a category of socialist economy and of the planned management method was determined. The need for trade and money in the first communist phase was substantiated. The objectively economic nature of categories such as production costs, price, credit, and

finances was clarified. The summation of the experience acquired in the struggle for lowering public labor outlays and for rational economic management led to the conclusion that under the conditions of a socialist economy the law of value operates as an element subordinated to the planned development system.

The study of Marxist works on economic problems written in the 1920's and 1930's shows the gradual elaboration of the scientific concept of socialist economic laws. As early as the end of the 1930's views dominated according to which socialism has its own economic laws. However, a certain inconsistency and contradictoriness could still be noted in their interpretation, from the viewpoint of the proper understanding of the factual ratio between the objective and the subjective in economics. While considering the development of socialism as a natural historical process and while acknowledging certain objective correlations in economics (such as, for example, between accumulation and consumption, and between labor productivity and wages), some authors, nevertheless, introduced in their interpretations considerable elements of subjectivism. Thus, they frequently identified the juridical laws passed by the socialist state with objective economic laws. No distinction was made between the economic policy of the state and the objective laws governing the development of the socialist economy. This was substantiated by the fact that the state system was in the hands of the working class which represented both the main productive force of society and the subject of ruling production relations. In this case the objective development of production forces and production relations was identified with the conscious and planned influence of society on this development.

We must bear in mind that these theoretical views were shaped under circumstances governed by a sharp class struggle, at a time when the economic foundations of socialism were being laid. Under the pretext of the need to take into consideration objective laws, elements hostile to the Soviet system called for opening the way to the free development of market relations and for reducing to naught our plans to anticipating this uncontrolled process. Defending the general party line, the Soviet economists substantiated and emphasized the tremendous transforming role of the socialist state and of its planned activities in economic construction, a role aimed at the victory of socialism. However, because of the still underdeveloped methodology of the study of the socialist economy, in a number of cases its building and development were interpreted as the consciously formulated new economic laws by the state, i.e., objective processes were identified with subjective activities (such as, for example, the planned development of the national economy with planning). Despite the entire methodological immaturity of such interpretations, under the prevailing circumstances this was historically explainable and, for a while, justified, for it expressed the factual needs of the revolutionary reorganization of the economy, aiming at the counter-revolutionary concepts of the capitalist restoration.

The intensive debates which took place in the 1930's and, particularly, at the end of the 1940's and beginning of the 1950's, played a major role in the development of the methodology of economic science in our country. Let us single out among them the 1951 discussion sponsored by the party's Central Committee in connection with the writing of a textbook on political economy. It was precisely after it that economic publications systematically promoted the concept of the objective nature of socialist economic laws and of the possibility of their conscious utilization in the social interest. This clear demarcation between objective and subjective factors in the development of the socialist economy, in the course of their interaction, considerably broadened the scientific base for improving planning and economic management practices.

The Soviet Union reached new heights in the development of the socialist economy in the 1950's and 1960's. The party and the people faced complex problems and tasks related to the possibility which arose for converting to the direct development of the building of communism in our country. The most important economic conclusions which were drawn at the beginning of the 1960's were reflected in the CPSU program passed at its 22nd Congress. It summed up the party's collective experience based on the full and final victory of socialism in the USSR. This was the basis for conclusions on future historical progress. On the basis of its supreme objective--the building of a communist society--the party formulated as the main economic task of that stage the creation of the material and technical foundations for communism. On the methodological level, these program stipulations prove, first of all, that the party systematically supports the historical principle and proceeds from the need for the total development of socialism and the gradual ripening of communism on its basis through the accumulated quantitative changes and their conversion into qualitative ones; secondly, the formulation of the task of creating the material and technical foundations for communism as a principal task, meant that the party was giving priority to the development of the country's production forces, guided by the Marxist concept of the primacy of production in the process of the growth of socialism into communism; thirdly, it followed from these concepts that the party had taken into consideration the most important new phenomenon of the contemporary epoch--the development of the scientific and technical revolution.

The implementation of the CPSU program encountered difficulties caused by manifestations of subjectivism in the approach to economic management. The decisions of the October 1964 and subsequent Central Committee plenums and of the 23rd Party Congress determined the need and indicated the specific means for surmounting such difficulties. The principal requirement was to build our entire planning and economic activities on the solid foundation of objective assessments, accurate information, systematic consideration of economic laws, and fuller utilization of scientific achievements.

It was precisely on this basis that the party formulated a number of measures in the field of agriculture (the decisions of the March 1965 CPSU Central Committee Plenum) and industry (the 1965 Economic Reform), which changed

the very approach to the management of the economic process. The characteristic feature of these party decisions was their comprehensiveness and the complex consideration of ripe problems. They not only materialized the achievements of economic theory but stimulated its further creative development.

In its activities the party maintains the unbreakable unity between economics and politics and theory and practice. Formulating its long-term economic strategy, the party reformulated a number of theoretical problems. The basic features of the economy of the mature socialist society in which the characteristics of the effect of socialist economic laws at the present stage are manifested more specifically, were profoundly revealed and studied. It was on such a scientific basis that the possibility and necessity for a sharp turn in the policy of the CPSU toward raising the level of satisfaction of the growing needs of the people and the interconnection between this turn and the growth of output and the acceleration of scientific and technical progress were proved.

The 24th and 25th Party Congresses played a great role in substantiating the need for reaching a qualitatively new level in the planned development of the national economy, consistent with the present higher level of production socialization. The characteristic features of planned development at the mature socialist stage include a broader coverage of various social processes and, above all, of the utilization of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, and a more organized and balanced development of the entire national economy. All this requires substantial changes in the organizational structure of the economy and in its management mechanism. In planning practices the vital problems resolved by the party are reflected in a comprehensive approach and target programs, in combining sectorial with territorial planning, in the consistent consideration of the time factor, and in the development of long-term plans. The specific tasks in the development of the material and technical base of society were defined on a new basis: The main emphasis was placed on upgrading work quality and effectiveness. The profound scientific understanding of the laws governing social and scientific and technical progress in their inseparable unity found its summed up expression in the party's formulation of the task of combining the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism. Lenin's idea of the decisive importance of labor productivity to the economic victory of the new social system was developed further. The practical solutions of this essential problem was concretized in accordance with contemporary requirements.

Formulating the basic directions for further research in the field of the social sciences, including political economy, the 25th CPSU Congress singled out in particular the theoretical problems of developed socialism and its gradual growth into communism. These problems involve the further improvement of socialist production relations and their utilization in the development of production forces. The practical solution of existing economic problems is closely linked with the comprehensive program for scientific and technical progress and its social consequences.

III.

Today the methodological problems which appear in connection with the studies of the mature socialist economy and the ways for its gradual growth into a communist economy are key problems in the field of political economy. Among them, the problem of the development of socialist ownership, based on increasing production socialization, assumes prime significance.

The basic formulation of the problem, theoretically and practically, was provided by Lenin in the first years of the Soviet system. On the basis of the fundamental Marxist theoretical stipulation of the need for a revolutionary substitution of private ownership of productive capital with social ownership, and summing up the initial practical steps taken in the implementation of this program stipulation, Lenin concretized and substantiated the ways for the strengthening and development of socialist ownership as a factual economic relation. Lenin combined all this within a single task of converting from the expropriation of the expropriators to factual socialization. This inaugurated a new category which played a tremendous role in the scientific substantiation of the expanded program for economic construction in our country and which has retained its full scientific significance as the main guideline in the specific-historical analysis of the stages of economic development of the socialist society.

The building of the material and technical foundations for communism determines the further development of socialist ownership and leads to a new and higher level of socialist socialization of labor and production. The topical nature of political economic studies of socialist ownership in connection with the growth of production forces and the intensification of production socialization processes at the present stage is determined precisely by the fact that it is a question of the initial and main link within the system of socialist production relations. Political economy has the important task of extensively determining the factual content of socialist ownership of productive capital as the foundation of the Soviet economic system. This is of major theoretical and practical significance, for the development and consolidation of the public ownership of productive capital predetermines the development of all aspects of production relations within the socialist society.

Scientific publications are dealing quite extensively with matters related to the development of the material foundation of public ownership (increased scale of output, its concentration, and the development of the social division of labor or, in a word, the various aspects of the continuing socialization of production and labor). Great attention is paid to the study of the two forms of socialist ownership and the ways of their development. However, so far, few definitive works on the political-economic study of ownership by the whole people and the development of its specific content, have been published.

Productive capital ownership is the factual, the essential economic relation, the relation among people concerning the acquisition of labor objects and means. This is a historically determined method for linking the worker with productive capital, on the basis of which all other aspects of production relations develop. However, the method for such linkage may not be reduced to the form of this linkage. Whereas the people are the joint owners of socialized productive capital, this, then, is directly manifested in the conditions and nature of utilization of the latter. Socialist ownership in its two forms (whole people and kolkhoz-cooperative) is factually manifested in relations of comradely cooperation and mutual aid based on the joint use of productive capital. These relations are characterized by a profound interest displayed by the workers in joint labor, conscious labor discipline, mass socialist competition, and concern for the most effective and economical utilization of the social wealth. In other words, socialized ownership is directly manifested in specific forms of cooperation among people ensuring the most personal (not only psychologically but in terms of factual economic practice) attitude toward the tools, objects, and results of their joint labor.

The development of ownership by the whole people, therefore, represents the broadening and intensification of planned cooperation among working people as the joint owners of all public production, developing it in the common interest of enhancing the people's prosperity. This determines the role of each unit, individual labor collectives, associations, and management organs in the systematic implementation of the principle of democratic centralism. Ownership by the whole people and work in the interest of the whole people are inseparably related and interlocked phenomena. Political economy studies the socialist ownership of productive capital as a factual economic relation which determines the nature of all other production relations and, in this sense, is the base of the socialist economic system.

One of the most important problems in socialist political economy, related to the practical achievement of ownership by the whole people, is the theoretical substantiation of optimum national economic development planning. The general concepts governing this problem are no longer sufficiently developed in economics. The resources of the national economy have increased substantially and its industrial base has gained a powerful and comprehensive development. Tremendous planning experience has been acquired. Conditions have been created for taking more fully into consideration in planning scientific requirements the economic laws of socialism. Therefore, the national economic plan must reflect the comprehensive interrelationships in the ratios and the economic mechanism which would ensure the fullest possible solution of social problems with the highest production effectiveness.

The course to effectiveness and quality, charted at the 25th CPSU Congress, formulates a very important optimality element. It is a question of linking more tightly the natural (quantity, variety, and quality of products) with the value (outlays) aspects of the plan. The optimality criterion, based on the maximum socially useful product and the reaching of highest

possible effectiveness, is important also from the viewpoint of the time factor; this criterion ensures not only the creation of resources for the present but the necessary stockpile for expanded reproduction. It must be extended to cover any planned period. Yet, the flexibility of the plan and the possibility for its constant checking against practice and introduction of respective changes must be ensured through the organic interconnection among long-term, medium-term, and short-term plans. In other words, all the requirements of a scientific approach must be applied to the plan: Comprehensive coverage of economic relations, the principle of the steadily progressive development of the economy, and consideration of changing requirements and production conditions.

In the course of the planned development of the socialist economy its specific laws are subjected to constant interaction and interpenetration. Therefore, their practical utilization in economic management necessarily presumes the comprehensive study of production relations under specific conditions, in accordance with the determining role of the basic economic law on socialism.

The content of planning consists not simply of providing conscious support to the functioning of a specific system of relations but of ensuring their development. The inseparable connection between economic functioning and development is a most important stipulation of Marxist-Leninist political economy of direct importance to planning practice. Planning, as a steadily maintained proportionality, does not consist of an inert "balance" but of dynamic development with optimum results ensuring progress toward communism.

The planned nature of development of the socialist national economy reformulates the problem of contradictions and their study in the field of political economy. Here the proper distinction between the two types of contradictions--antagonistic and non-antagonistic--is of great methodological significance in understanding the process of the growth of the socialist into a communist economy.

Socialist economy retains rudimentary vestiges of the past such as, for example, stealing, plundering, and others, whose nature is antagonistic. Such phenomena are profoundly alien and hostile to socialism. In the process of the development of socialism these phenomena are suppressed through the use, among others, of administrative means. However, non-antagonistic contradictions exist. They are created by the very progress of production forces and socialist production relations and their dialectical interaction. Such contradictions are resolved not by eliminating one or another aspect but through the planned support of their coordination and the comprehensive development of both interacting sides. Socialist economic relations grow into communist relations through the gradual solution and elimination of their internally inherent contradictions on the basis of the building of the material and technical base for communism. An understanding of this fact is of exceptional importance in the development of the problems of the economic mechanism at the present stage.

Objectively, non-antagonistic contradictions are found in the level of development of social labor inherent in socialism. The directly social labor under socialism is labor based on public ownership and performed in the interests of the satisfaction of social requirements. It is plannedly organized yet, at the same time, it has not as yet become the prime vital necessity. It requires material incentive and the strictest possible public accounting and control. The solution of this contradiction is achieved gradually, with the ripening of a higher form of social labor and its growth into communist labor.

The improper interpretation of contradictions within the socialist economy has an adverse effect both on the study of individual categories and the elaboration of a socialist political economy system. This was manifested particularly clearly in the discussions on market-monetary relations. The extensive discussion of this matter within the science of economics led, in the final account, to the conclusion that market-monetary relations are a necessary element of socialist economy and are subordinated to planned development. The pitting of marketing-monetary relations to planning offers nothing in terms of theory or practice. It prevents us from successfully resolving the problems related to strengthening self-financing at the present stage.

The objective of production under socialism is the immediate satisfaction of social requirements for material goods. However, the possibilities to increase the amount of consumer values and improve their quality largely depend on costs per unit of output. In turn, cost reductions depend on the growth of social labor productivity. Therefore, legitimately giving priority to consumer values as the objective of socialist production, we can not ignore costs, for this would harm socialist economic management quite substantially.

The planned resolution of non-antagonistic contradictions under socialism is ensured through the systematic implementation of democratic centralism in economic management, strengthening the system of centralized management in accordance with the tasks of scientific and technical progress, the creation of extensive opportunities for the manifestation of initiative and sufficient flexibility in the individual economic units, and the combination of the interests of individual workers and collectives with the interests of the national economy as a whole. The 25th Party Congress called for improving further socialist economic management methods and the more skillful and scientifically substantiated use of economic incentives. Consequently, an overall system for self-financed planning and management of socialist enterprises is being elaborated. The solution of this problem is related most closely with upgrading production effectiveness and work quality in the entire national economy. The scientifically substantiated use of economic levers is contributing to the planned development of socialist production and is its structural component.

The creative application and development of Marxist-Leninist methodology is a prerequisite for success in political economic studies of all kinds. The increased attention which Soviet economists are paying to methodological problems, and discussions on such topics are entirely justified. Here the ratio between theory and practice is particularly important. For the first time in history the Soviet people are building a communist society and the true way for this movement is provided only by summed up practical experience based on Marxist-Leninist methodology.

Occasionally the correlation between theory and practice is reduced to the fact that theory should have a practical significance. However, this is not enough. Practice is a criterion of truth and a source of knowledge. We are well familiar with Marx's statement that the argument on the existence or non-existence of thought, isolated from practice, is a purely scholastic matter. Therefore, for example, we disagree with the fact that the principle of unity between the logical and the historical approach could replace, at any given stage of research, the primacy of the logical principle. This is an attempt to derive a concept exclusively on the basis of another concept. Yet, this process must be achieved only through the use of practice. Speaking of Marx's method used in "Das Kapital," Lenin pointed out that "the analysis is double, deductive and inductive, logical and historical. . . . At each step of the analysis facts. . . . must be checked against practice" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 29, p 302). The essence is to master quality without neglecting the quantitative aspect. . . . Theoretical analysis must be tested against practice not only in order to determine the accuracy of a theoretical study but also because this is "the practical determinant of the connection between an object and what a person needs" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 42, p 290).

We believe that Lenin's description of Marx's method is of very topical significance in the light of the instructions of the 25th CPSU Congress to the effect that scholastic theorizing could only hinder our progress and that only ties with practice could enhance scientific effectiveness. The mastering of Marxist-Leninist methodology will require a struggle both against scholastic theorizing and coarse empiricism. The intensified study of the Leninist stage in the methodology of political economy is a major prerequisite for scientific success.

5003

CSO: 1802

THE ROLE OF BOOKS IN SOVIET SOCIETY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 59-70

[Article by B. Stukalin, USSR State Committee for Publishing chairman]

[Text] Thanks to the daily concern of the Communist Party and Soviet state book publishing in our country has assumed unparalleled scope. It is developing in accordance with the steadily expanding socioeconomic and spiritual needs of the working people.

Books to the Soviet people have become not simply a tool for knowledge, professional advancement, and exposure to the values of culture, but a spiritual instructor, and a source of ideological and moral growth. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, pointed out in his greeting to the participants and guests of the International Book Exhibit, books "help to arm millions of people with a truly scientific outlook, to master the laws of social development, and to fight for social progress."

Mass information and propaganda media, including book publishing, play an exceptionally important role in the communist upbringing of the working people and their mobilization for the successful implementation of the party's plans for economic and cultural construction. The CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th Party Congress noted the enhancement of the ideological standard and the coordination and efficiency of the work of mass information and propaganda media and their increased impact on the development of the economy, science, and culture, and of all public life. The congress faced the Soviet book publishers with tasks of exceptional significance: To ensure the further upgrading of the ideological-theoretical and artistic standard of publications; considerably to increase the volume of output and improve the quality of the books for children and adolescents, textbooks, and training and visual aids.

The increased requirements facing Soviet book publishing stem from the new USSR Constitution. The right of citizens of the Soviet Union to utilize the achievements of culture is ensured, along with other guarantees, as

stipulated in Article 46, through the development of book publishing and the periodical press. The constitution calls for issuing free textbooks to students.

In the period of organization of Soviet book publishing, V. I. Lenin pointed out that "one of the greatest evils and misfortunes we have inherited from the old capitalist system is the complete break between books and practical life. . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 41, p 302). Naturally, constant concern for maintaining the closest possible connection between books and social practice became the tone-setting party activities in publishing. Today we could state with full justification that the gap indicated by Vladimir Il'ich has been filled. This was a natural consequence of the party's policy, the cultural revolution, the broadest possible development of socialist democracy, the blossoming of literature, art, science, and technology, and increased book publishing possibilities.

Today the Soviet book publishing system can effectively participate in the solution of the most important socioeconomic and cultural problems, quickly reacting to current needs. This is exemplified by the operative mass production and wide distribution of the most important party documents--the decisions and materials of CPSU congresses and of its Central Committee plenums. Guided by the party's instructions that the dissemination of the ideas and decisions of its 25th Congress is the basis of all ideological work in the immediate future, the publishing houses put out the congress materials in over 40 million copies. The central and republic publishing houses are extensively publishing the works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in which the party's tremendous experience in guiding the economic, sociopolitical, and cultural life in the country is concentrated, the theoretical foundations of the activities of the party and the state at the present stage developed, and the historical accomplishments of the Soviet people in the building of communism and the development of the world socialist system and the international communist and workers' movements interpreted and analyzed profoundly, in a Leninist fashion.

The publication of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's recollections "Malaya Zemlya" and "Vozrozhdeniye" [Rebirth] became a major event in our public life. These recollections are a priceless example of revolutionary fashion, party conviction, and Leninist attitude toward the needs and expectations of the people. They carry deep summations and a spirit of historicism. They clearly show the link between the heroic past and the present. Behind the destinies of soldiers and officers, workers and engineers, and party workers and industry managers--Leonid Il'ich's fellow workers at the front and in the post-war restoration of the national economy--the readers see the character of the author himself--the loyal Leninist and outstanding political leader whose life is inseparably linked with the party and the people.

The main content of the socio-political works published after the 25th Congress has been the study of the most topical problems of mature socialism as a natural stage in the development of the communist system and the

creation of the material and technical base of communism. A number of books and pamphlets describe the comprehensive creative initiative and inspired toil of the Soviet people implementing the party's ideas and decisions.

Publications on the foreign political activities of our party and state and on their systematic and purposeful struggle for the implementation of the peace program adopted at the 24th Congress and further developed in the decisions of the 25th and in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's articles and speeches, play a particular role. The books and pamphlets on this topic emphasize the tremendous contribution to the implementation of the peace program made by the party's Central Committee, its Politburo and, personally, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, who plays an outstanding role in asserting the noble ideas of peace, security, and cooperation among nations.

Works published on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution are imbued with the congress ideas. They were written by scientific collectives, noted Soviet scientists and writers, publicists, and leading industrial and agricultural production workers. We can not ignore the variety of topics covered in the anniversary publications, covering all aspects of the building of communism, and describing the great revolutionary changes in the country, in each of its component republic, kray, and oblast, and economic and cultural sectors in six great decades. These publications and, above all, the party documents and the works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev carry an ideological charge of tremendous inspiring and life-asserting power. They contain new theoretical stipulations and scientific summations and conclusions of most important significance to the development of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the mature socialist society and the improved management of socioeconomic construction.

Many of the anniversary-focused petitions are sharply polemic and aggressive, substantively exposing the bourgeois falsifiers of the Soviet state and the fabrications of ideological opponents. Characteristic of such works is a profound belief in the historical rightness and great vitality of Marxism-Leninism, and the party's ideas and general line. Using irrefutable facts and arguments, their authors convincingly prove the unquestionable advantages of the socialist system and Soviet way of life, proving the doom of the bourgeois socio-political system and its anti-humane and anti-democratic nature.

Yet, not all books on socio-political topics published recently could be considered successes by their authors and publishing houses. Some of them repeat materials already familiar to the readership. The study of specific life phenomena is replaced by abstract theorizing unrelated to the practice of the building of communism. The fact that the percentage of works dealing with historical topics, compared with publications studying the processes of contemporary social development remains excessively high is one of the major shortcomings. So far an insufficient number of works have been published on the profound study and summation of practical data covering important problems such as the national-governmental development of the peoples of the USSR, the shaping of the new man, and the promotion of socialist labor discipline.

The adoption of the new USSR Constitution, which reflected the tremendous achievements of the mature socialist society, created exceptionally favorable conditions for the dissemination of the advantages of the developed socialist society. Many publishing houses have already published works showing the essentially new concepts included in this historical document and our great accomplishments and truly democratic rights and freedoms of the Soviet citizens, compared with the imaginary freedoms of the bourgeois society. This includes, in particular, the publication of works such as "Osnovnoy Zakon Nashey Zhizni" [Fundamental Law of our Life], and "Konstitutsiya Razvityego Sotsializma" [Constitution of Developed Socialism] (Politizdat), "Pravo Razvityego Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva" [Law in the Developed Socialist Society], and "Lichnost', Svoboda, Pravo" [Individual, Freedom, Law] (Yuridicheskaya Literatura). The publication of the popular series on "The Constitution of the State of the Whole People (Yuridicheskaya Literatura), "Constitution of the USSR. The Economic System of Developed Socialism" (Ekonomika), and "The New Constitution of the USSR" (Znaniye) is continuing. In accordance with the instructions of the 25th CPSU Congress, for the first time the multiple-volume USSR Legal Code is being undertaken.

The republic publishing houses carried out extensive organizational-creative work in connection with the discussion of the constitutions of union republics. In the future as well the writing and distribution of publications propagandizing and explaining union and republic constitutions will remain one of the main directions in the activities of publishing houses and book trade organizations, and the USSR and union republic state committees for publishing houses.

The circle of readers interested in works on the improvement of the economic mechanism, socialist production management, organization of the socialist competition, and dissemination of leading experience in industry and agriculture is widening steadily. Justifiably, the readers demand of such books and pamphlets to be as practical as is possible and provide direct assistance to engineers, foremen, technicians, workers, brigade leaders, and economists. A number of publications sum up the experience of labor collectives in the most important economic sectors and territorial-industrial complexes developed on the basis of Tyumen' petroleum, Orenburg natural gas, the biggest Siberian electric power plants, and the Kursk Magnetic Anomaly; they describe the great accomplishments of the builders of the Baykal-Amur Main Line and the achievements of the rural workers changing the aspect of the Nonchernozem Zone. Through books patriotic initiatives become familiar to millions of people. The pleasing fact that the authors of an ever larger number of works are themselves creators of leading experience--noted workers, kolkhoz members, engineers, agronomists, and party and soviet workers--clearly proves the strengthening ties between books and communist building practices.

Popular interpublishing house series are printed such as "Heroes of the Five-Year Plan," "Give All Collectives the Experience of the Best," and "Labor Exploit People." A number of series of books and pamphlets on such topics issued by the publishing houses of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, Latvia, Kazakhstan, and other republics are enjoying success.

Unfortunately, we still come across books and pamphlets written according to a cliché, of a descriptive nature which does not describe innovative work methods or "secrets" of high professional skills. Some works on labor heroes seem identical and schematic. Frequently, a short biographic reference and a list of production successes, awards, and fulfilled social assignments are given instead of passionate live descriptions of interesting people whose work and lives should be used as examples to emulate.

The publishing houses always focus their attention on problems of propaganda and implementation of the party's agrarian policy. In accordance with the decisions of the July 1978 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which earmarked the main ways and specific measures for the further upsurge of the agricultural sector of our economy, the USSR and republic state committees for publishing houses have earmarked and are already implementing a plan for the printing and extensive distribution of works on problems of socialist agriculture at the present stage.

The party's course of upgrading social production effectiveness on the basis of scientific and technical progress is being ever more extensively reflected in the activities of central and local publishing houses. A considerable number of monographs, collections, and instruction manuals are being published on the latest achievements of science and technology in all economic realms and sectors. For example, every year specialists are given some 300 books and pamphlets on problems of nuclear physics, controlled thermonuclear synthesis, and so on. We know the role which computers and automated planning and management systems play in modern science and the national economy. As the result of properly organized and efficient ties between the Nauka, Energiya, Mashinostroyeniye, Sovetskoye Radio, Nedra, and Transport publishing houses, and the collectives of the corresponding scientific and scientific and technical institutions, almost one-quarter of the entire output of these publishing houses in recent years have consisted of books on various problems of automation, telemechanics, and computers. At the same time, the publication of books on various theoretical problems of the natural sciences is increasing with every passing year.

The development of the scientific and technical revolution led to the appearance of new scientific and production sectors, new skills and, correspondingly, training courses and disciplines offered by higher and secondary specialized schools, a drastic increase in the exchange of scientific and technical information, and the need to raise the skills of millions of working people and broaden the system of cadre training and retraining. All this determined the considerable increase in the size of textbooks and reference-encyclopedia editions. Thus, compared with 1960, the number of VUZ textbooks has increased by one-half both in terms of titles and edition size. In the Ninth Five-Year Plan the country published about 30,000 production and other reference works totalling over one-third of a billion copies.

Yet, along with the positive trends in the publication of scientific and technical works, a number of unresolved problems remain. Let us mention, above all, errors in the formulation of topic plans. On the one hand, this

results in the development of "white spots," and, on the other, to an unjustifiable attraction to sufficiently well-developed problems. The effectiveness of many works is drastically reduced by the excessively long time taken in preparing and printing the manuscripts. The operativeness of the publishers largely determines whether or not one or another scientific development will reach interested specialists on time or will become obsolete, thus failing to reach the plant, factory, or design bureau at all.

Soviet belles lettres exercise an exceptional influence on the minds and hearts of the people. The books of Lenin Prize Laureates M. Sholokhov, L. Leonov, N. Tikhonov, G. Markov, A. Tvardovskiy, M. Tursun-zade, E. Mezheletis, K. Simonov, M. Tank, N. Gribachev, A. Chakovskiy, Ch. Aytmatov, R. Gamzatov, S. Mikhalkov, Y. Avizhyus, Yu. Bondarev, O. Gonchar, and other outstanding Soviet writers have become part of the golden treasury of domestic literature and are famous far beyond our country. They have displayed the best features inherent in the literature of socialist realism--passionate party-mindedness, depth of artistic study of life phenomena, and the correct choice and characteristic of a style best consistent with the richness of content.

In the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th Party Congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that "ideological direction, naturally, remains the main criterion in assessing the social significance of any work." Naturally, ensuring the high ideological-artistic level of a book is the first concern not only of authors and creative unions but of publishers. Steadily increasing the publication of contemporary belles lettres, along with the classics, the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses directs the publishing houses to influencing more effectively the development of the literary process and supporting phenomena and trends which mark the further expansion and strengthening of relations between literature and the life of the people, ideological maturity, and the growing professional skills of the writers.

Young talented reinforcements are steadily entering literature. Following the adoption of the 1976 CPSU Central Committee decree "On Work with Creative Youth," the publishing houses noticeably energized their work with young authors. As a rule, certain material resources are set aside in publishing plants for the active publication of talented works by young writers.

Central and republic publishing houses have begun to issue special series such as "New Names," "First Book in the Capital," "Debut," "Young Voices," and others. Naturally, however, this is not to say that all aspects of the work with the creative young people are adequate. The important duty of central and republic publishing houses is to give timely support to every talented author and to create all the conditions necessary for the development of his talent.

The problem has another aspect. Supporting the creativity of the young does not mean in the least that the criteria used in assessing their works should be lowered. Attentiveness, and sympathy, combined with strict exactingness,

should determine the style and content of our work with creative youth. We should mention this in connection with the fact that some publishers either ignore young authors or substitute serious and painstaking work with them with hasty publications of raw, insufficiently mature works. In either case the beginning writers themselves and their creative growth are damaged and, consequently, literature as a whole.

A qualitatively new level has been reached in the publication of works in the languages of the people of the USSR. This clearly confirms the blossoming of the multi-national socialist culture, the unusually expanded opportunities for the further intensification of the process of reciprocal enrichment of national cultures among all fraternal nations and nationalities, and the joining in of the toiling masses of our country with the treasures of world culture.

The successes achieved by Soviet multi-national book publishing have been recognized the world over. It is no accident that it was precisely the Soviet Union that was the seat in 1976 of the UNESCO international symposium on the development of book publishing in multi-lingual countries. The participants in the symposium could see with their own eyes that the fabrications of bourgeois propaganda about the "damaging" of the national originality of the peoples of the USSR and their cultural traditions and customs had nothing in common with reality. It was only after the revolution that tens of peoples and nationalities acquired their own alphabet and now read domestic and foreign authors in their native languages. Children of ethnic groups numbering no more than several thousand are using textbooks in their own languages. The publication of V. I. Lenin's Complete Collected Works and of national encyclopedias and other most complex works convincingly proves the maturity reached by book publishing in union republics. The network of publishing houses is expanding as well. In the past six years, for example, eight new publishing houses have been set up in the union republics. In 1977 printed matter in our country included 60 languages of the peoples of the USSR and 49 foreign languages.

An unparalleled increase in the mass demand for books began to be noted in the country starting with the second half of the 1960's. What are the contributing factors to this? Unquestionably, this is a manifestation of the legitimate development of our society. Essential changes have taken place in the period of mature socialism in all realms of life in the country, creating even more favorable conditions for newspapers, periodicals, and books to enter every house and family, making reading the most vital need of the entire people. This is one of the major accomplishments of Leninist cultural policy which placed the first victorious socialist country in the world in the vanguard of the world's cultural progress.

Currently the country issues annually over 85,000 titles of books and pamphlets. In 1977 their overall number of copies exceeded 1.8 billion. For a number of years the Soviet Union has held a leading position in the world in the absolute volume of printing output. Whereas in 1975, according to

official UNESCO data, the share of the USSR in the population on earth was eight percent, it accounted for 14 percent of the world's written works output in terms of number of publications.

Today our people deservedly enjoy the reputation of being the biggest readers in the world. According to sociologists nearly every Soviet family has its own library. Over 90 percent of books published in the USSR are sold out in the year of their publication.

The tremendous rise of the demand for printed works reflects the steady rise of the spiritual potential of Soviet society. Compared with 1950, in 1976 the USSR population had risen by a 1.4 factor while annual issues had risen by factors of 17 for journals, 5.5 for newspapers, and 2.13 for books. The publication of socio-political works has been marked by a particularly fast growth. Under the Soviet system V. I. Lenin's works have been issued 13,473 times in over 500 million copies. The leader's Complete Collected Works have been published in 55 volumes averaging 600,000 copies each. The works of K. Marx and F. Engels have been published in 115 million copies.

The inordinate capacity of the book market may be judged also by data characterizing the popularity of belles-lettres in the country, domestic classics above all. In the past 60 years A. S. Pushkin's books have been issued in 213 million copies; in 1974, on the occasion of the 175th anniversary of his birth, a 12th million volume publication of his works was sold out in numbered days. The works of L. N. Tolstoy, whose 150th anniversary is celebrated this year by all progressive mankind, have been published in the Soviet Union in about 219 million copies. In the course of the anniversary year the readers will be given another tens of millions of copies of books written by the great Russian writer. Bearing in mind the tremendous demand for his works, Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennaya Literatura will issue a new subscribers' edition of the collected works of L. N. Tolstoy in 22 volumes and one million copies. This is the first time in the history of Soviet book publishing that such a big edition of collected works will be published.

Each volume of the 200-volume World Literature Library was issued in 300,000 copies. Following the completion of the series, extensively noted by the Soviet public, the publication of the non-subscription Classics Library was undertaken. Each volume of this edition comes out in one or more million copies.

To gain a more accurate idea of the processes taking place in the country's book market let us consider changes in the nature of readership requirements. Only 20-25 years ago the customer bought essentially individual works. The share of collected works and other works were continued (serial) publications of works purchased by the population remained relatively low. Today the situation has changed radically. The greatest demand is, precisely, for subscribers and serial publications, both belles-lettres and socio-political and scientific and technical. This has brought about certain changes in publishing practice. Whereas in 1950 the overall edition of volumes of all collected works of literary classics and contemporary writers equalled 7.5 million copies, in 1977 the number of copies had exceeded 20 million.

Publications such as one or multiple-volumes sectorial encyclopedias, linguistic and technical dictionaries, and sets including audiovisual means for students of foreign languages have become widespread. Presently a one-volume encyclopedia containing 80,000 articles is under preparation. It will be issued in millions of copies.

The steadily rising interest and nationwide love for books trigger in the publishers, along with great satisfaction and legitimate pride, a feeling of tremendous responsibility. It is no longer a question of saturating the book market and satisfying more fully consumer demand but, above all, of making Soviet books even more active promoters of CPSU policy and an even more effective instrument in the implementation of the program for the building of communism.

These principal tasks set by the party to Soviet book publishing can not be implemented without relying on the public, and without daily efficient contacts with scientific organizations, creative unions, and collectives of plants, construction projects, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes. A great deal is already being done for such interaction with the public and the readership at large to become one of the determining principles in book publishing. As a rule, the topic plans of specialized publishing houses are related to the plans of respective scientific institutions, while leading scientific collectives and individual specialists become authors, consultants, reviewers, and editors of monographs, collections, and textbooks. Supernumerary editorial counsels have been set up by union and republic state committees for publishing and by publishing houses. The central publishing houses alone employ in this capacity over 3,000 scientists, and over 500 writers, painters, and composers.

In recent years the prestige of editorial counsels as public organs has risen noticeably. Basic problems of publishing policy are resolved with their help, taking into consideration the views and suggestions of the representatives of the public. For example, when the shortage of domestic and foreign classics became particularly acute on the country's book market, the problem was submitted for discussion by the public council of the USSR State Committee for Publishing. As a result, a decision was taken to change the existing ratios in the publication of various types of works. A number of central specialized scientific and technical and socio-political publishing houses were asked to produce, out of their own newsprint, belles-lettres works. In accordance with the suggestions expressed by the council regulations were passed limiting the sizes of the various types of publications: Monographs, collections, articles, popular science works, and others. Stricter control was established over the publishing of departmental works. The number of organizations with the right to print their own official publications, bypassing publishing houses, was curtailed. Publishing limits were established for each such organization.

The purpose of these and other measures adopted on the council's recommendations is the more efficient use of paper resources allocated for book publishing. Statistical figures will clearly show that certain results have

already been achieved. Thus, compared with 1975, in 1977 paper outlays for overall book publishing rose 4.6 percent, compared with 17.7 percent for belles-lettres and children's literature. This line will be systematically followed in the future.

The public participates very actively in the consideration of correlated topic plans which are sent ahead of time to party and soviet organs, ministries, departments, scientific institutions, and creative unions. Advance discussions enriches them with new topics and triggers most interesting publishing ventures. The practice of social orders is extensively used in the implementation of many of them. This was precisely the origin of the collections of essays, highly rated by the readers and the press, on outstanding production innovators and leaders--"Worker's Valor," and "Golden Grains." The Ekonomika and Kolos publishing houses which issued these series involved the cooperation of leading Soviet writers and journalists, artists, and master photographers. The books were published on the eve of the 25th Party Congress. Currently the publishing houses annually issue such collections which are a kind of labor glory chronicle of heroes of the 10th Five-Year Plan.

An old favorite of the readers is a series of small booklets, entitled "The Writer and his Time" (Izdatel'stvo Sovetskaya Rossiya). In this series many famous writers of the Russian Federation share their thoughts on our time, the great accomplishments of the Soviet people, and the place and civic duty of literary workers.

A number of central scientific and technical publishing houses have organized the joint publication of the series "Reliability and Quality." Its authors are noted economic scientists and specialists. Izdatel'stvo Pedagogika has involved outstanding scientists in the preparation of a series on "Scientists to School Students," which popularize among student youth the latest scientific and technical achievements. A number of similar examples could be cited.

Regular discussions of new editions by collectives of working people have become one of the effective feedback channels between book makers and readers. Naturally, readers' conferences are not a new method for determining the quality of publications. However, now, when the role of labor collectives in resolving not only problems of a production nature or internal life, but major socio-cultural problems has increased on an unparalleled basis, this type of contact among authors, publishers, and readers has gained a new meaning.

Readers' conferences at which entire sections of literature, serial publications, and special series dealing with various sectors of knowledge are discussed, have become a common phenomenon. They involve the participation of hundreds of specialists, workers, and kolkhoz members who study books on one or another topic in advance and thoroughly, and write skillful studies of the works. It would be no exaggeration to say that millions of Soviet

people are today exerting a direct influence on all stages of publishing activities, from the planning to the dissemination of publications. This is one of the manifestations of the high social activeness of the working people.

Every day a number of letters are received by publishing houses and editors of newspapers and periodicals, assessing their publications heatedly and with interest, and sharing thoughts on how to upgrade the effectiveness of books and bring them faster to the readers. It is noteworthy that, in our days, the book-lovers' movement has assumed a truly mass and organized nature. Numerous circles and clubs of book-lovers at libraries, culture houses, and bookstores, and voluntary distributors of books at enterprises and establishments are rallied around the all-union voluntary society of bibliophiles, numbering about eight million members. The book-lovers actively participate in improving the system of topic planning and size of editions, and study of demand for publications. The second-hand book trade is developing considerably thanks to the voluntary book promoters. Thus, in the past five years second-hand books worth over 156 million rubles were purchased and sold to the population. The new publication of such works would have required about 50,000 tons of paper.

One of the noble initiatives of the bibliophiles, worthy of the greatest support, is offering their private libraries for public use. This makes accessible to many readers a tremendous wealth of books, including extremely rare editions acquired in private collections, drastically upgrading the "readability coefficient" of each book. It is particularly important to emphasize this in connection with the fact that, unfortunately, far from always books from private collections are implementing their high purpose. Occasionally, the acquisition of such books becomes a case of profit-seeking accumulation while the books themselves are merely a fashionable part of the furnishings of a modern apartment and of the prestige-seeking ambitions of the owner.

Naturally, one could only hail the wish to have a private library so that favorite books or books consistent with professional interests, helping to meet the need for deeper political, and scientific knowledge, and curiosity, may always be handy. Publishing policy takes into consideration this ever growing natural need of the Soviet people.

At the same time, we can not ignore the obvious fact that today public library books are being used incomparably more efficiently. That is precisely why, together with the USSR Ministry of Culture, the USSR State Committee for Publishing is taking measures to ensure the more energetic expansion and improvement of book selections in state libraries. To this effect a number of works in greater demand have been published in a special Library Series which, bypassing the book trade, is shipped directly to libraries. Over the past five years they have received over 300 editions from this series, published by central publishing houses in over 33.5 million copies.

It is of exceptional importance to continue to improve the dissemination of books, approaching it on a more differentiated basis, in accordance with the requirements of various population strata, and to organize the exchange of

books among owners of private collections. Unquestionably, to use Lenin's metaphor, this would considerably increase book "drifting." The bibliophilic society, with its numerous local associations, must play a most active role in this project, in developing the readers' taste. Its honorable purpose is to organize libraries for the shock projects of the five-year plan through gifts made by private citizens, and to organize readers' conferences, meetings with authors, talks, and lectures on book news and on the most noteworthy literary phenomena.

Naturally, the extensive participation of the Soviet public in the planning, discussion, and dissemination of publications does not reduce in the least the responsibility of the USSR state and republic committees for publishing for the steady improvement of topic planning, coordination of publications, and scientific substantiation of edition sizes.

A number of unresolved problems remain here. Thus, whereas, with the help of a centralized coordination system, we have largely succeeded in eliminating the publication of duplicating and non-topical works, long-term topic planning requires substantial improvements. Extensive work remains to be done on establishing efficient size criteria with a view to linking them more closely with national economic programs and basic social development trends.

As we know, recently the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers passed the decree "On Conversion to the Free Use of Textbooks by Students of General Educational Schools," which calls for the adoption of practical measures to implement this important constitutional stipulation. Together with the public education organs, and relying on Komsomol organizations and parents' aktivs, book publishers and distributors must, from the very next school year, ensure the conversion of first graders and, in subsequent years, of all students to the use of free textbooks. This new manifestation of the party's concern for the growing generation is of major social and educational significance. The socialist society is assuming an ever broader range of concern for the upbringing, education, and spiritual growth of the citizens, the youth above all.

Currently, comprehensive work is already underway for the development in the schools of textbook libraries. The positive experience acquired in this matter by the Estonian, Moldavian, and other union republics is used. The public education organs and the collectives of textbook and education publishing houses and printing enterprises are entrusted with the great responsibility to improve the content of durable textbooks and upgrade the quality of printing, coloring, and durability. The conversion to cyclical (averaging once every four years) publication of hundreds of millions of textbooks will make it possible to save considerable quantities of paper and binding materials and release printing capacities. All this will be used for the additional publication of belles-lettres and of children's and training-method works.

Soviet books have invariably enjoyed great international prestige. Becoming ever more popular, they are, to the multimillion-strong readers, a source of truthful information on the first country of victorious socialism in the world, and on the domestic and foreign policy of the CPSU, bringing to them the most progressive ideas of the century and describing the bright prospects for the development of mankind.

The increased prestige and tremendous interest in Soviet books were confirmed by the first Moscow International Book Fair, held last autumn, with the participation of 1,535 publishing and book trade organizations from 67 countries, and publishing organs of the United Nations, the ILO, and other international organizations.

The book fair is far from being the only initiative of the Soviet publishers in the implementation of the Helsinki agreements in the field of cultural exchange. Over 13,000 publications were exhibited at the retrospective exposition of translated works published in the country under the Soviet system, held at the Central Exhibits Hall in Moscow, last July. This is only one-fifth of all books by foreign authors from 136 countries published in the USSR. Such books have been published in 2,186,000,000 copies.

The false claims of Western propaganda notwithstanding, on alleged barriers erected by the Soviet Union to block the dissemination of books by foreign authors, once again the exhibit public obtained clear and irrefutable proof of the fact that, in accordance with the party's cultural policy, and the spirit of the Helsinki accords, our country is acquainting extensively and unrestrictedly its citizens with all truly cultural, artistic, and scientific values of the peoples of the world.

An ever larger number of works jointly written by Soviet authors and foreign colleagues are being published in the USSR.

Publishers in the socialist countries are bound by particularly close and truly fraternal cooperation. The joint series of works on "Critique of Bourgeois Ideology and Revisionism" has been published since 1973. It exposes the "latest" concepts of the ideological enemies of socialism. Their topics cover the most important areas of the class struggle between the two world systems in the international arena--economics, politics, and ideology. Since 1976 the publishers of the socialist comity have been jointly producing series disseminating experience in the building of socialism and communism.

The Soviet Union is publishing series of literatures of the socialist countries, each of which is prepared with the active participation of our foreign friends. Seven socialist countries are simultaneously issuing the 35-volume "Victory Library." Twenty-seven books within this series have been published in the USSR.

In recent years practical cooperation between Soviet publishers and partners in the capitalist countries has developed considerably. A number of definitive scientific works in the fields of medicine and space research have been written through the joint efforts of USSR and United States scientists and publishers. Cooperation is strengthening between Soviet publishing houses and publishers in the capitalist and developing countries in the publication of linguistic and technical dictionaries, encyclopedias, and literary anthologies, and others.

The publication of the five-volume "European Poetry" collection by Khudozhestvennaya Literatura and Progress publishing houses met with extensive public response. In this venture poetry by authors of all countries on the continent is published in the original language and its Russian translation, while works by Soviet authors are translated into four European languages. This edition, as the recently completed 200 volume "World Literature Library," was welcomed with interest by the participants in the Belgrade Conference. It was considered a specific contribution made by Soviet publishers to strengthening international cultural cooperation based on the principles elaborated in Helsinki.

Soviet books are ever more actively participating in propaganda abroad of the advantages of socialism, the Soviet way of life, and the foreign and domestic policies of our party. In the Ninth Five-Year Plan the amount of works published in foreign languages in the country doubled in terms of titles and more than tripled in terms of size. With every passing year the share of works by the Marxist-Leninist classics and of books on the social sciences is rising in the overall amount of works published for foreign readers. By 1980 the publication of the Marxist-Leninist classics and, as a whole, of socio-political works in foreign languages will increase by no less than one-half. The publication of V. I. Lenin's Complete Collected Works in Vietnamese, and Selected Works in Dutch, Japanese, Hindi, Bengali, Tamil, Sinhalese, and Urdu, and the 50 volume Collected Works of K. Marx and F. Engels in English will continue. The publication of V. I. Lenin's Complete Collected Works in Spanish will be undertaken soon. With a view to upgrading the effectiveness of textbooks and school aids dealing with basic problems of Marxist-Leninist theory, the publishing houses have charted a course to the publication of original works taking into consideration the specific features of individual countries and areas. Works on CPSU theory and practice, the development of the international communist movement, the achievements of the USSR in the building of communism, and the foreign policy of the Soviet state are being prepared especially for the foreign readers.

The long-term plan for the development of Soviet book publishing through 1990, elaborated in accordance with the instructions of the 25th CPSU Congress, calls for the fuller satisfaction of population demand for books, the further enhancement of the ideological-scientific and artistic standards of the editions and their quality, and for improvements of material and technical printing facilities.

With a view to implementing the congress decisions on the most important directions of technical progress in printing and, above all, the extensive use of offset printing, photo-setting, and automated assembly lines, the USSR state and the republic committees on publishing are adopting corresponding organizational and technical measures. As a result, rotory offset printing--the most productive and economical--rose by a 1.7 factor in three years. The use of photo-setting has been expanded. The technology of color printing is being improved. Many binding shops are installing Kniga automated lines. This very year such lines will process about 190 million book copies. Today the production of high quality print books has increased not only in famous printing presses of Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev, but presses in Minsk, Riga, Vil'nyus, Khar'kov, Yaroslavl, Perm, Kishinev, Novosibirsk, and other cities.

Yet, whereas the best editions produced by domestic enterprises have repeatedly won the highest prizes of different international exhibits, the level of our mass book production is still far below contemporary requirements. This particularly applies to popular science books for children, photograph albums, and textbooks.

Printers, artists, and technical editors must dedicate a great deal of effort, inventiveness, and creative initiative considerably to improve the quality of the publications, making them more durable, convenient, and pleasing, mastering methods for the more efficient and economical utilization of material and production resources. The task of substantially speeding up the production cycle in publishing, in order to shorten the book distance from the editor's desk to the reader, is very topical.

Books contain the entire wealth and variety of the political, social, and spiritual experience of the multi-national Soviet people--the builders of communism--and of their moral and esthetic values. Never before have they played such an active role in the life of society or been so much needed by the broad masses. The materials of the 25th Party Congress and a number of CPSU Central Committee decrees on improving publishing in the country and the welcoming addresses presented by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to the personnel of Izdatel'stvo Detskaya Literatura and the participants in the 1975 International Book Exhibit earmark with exhausting clarity and depth the development of Soviet book publishing. These inspiring documents are a powerful incentive to the publishers in upgrading the effectiveness and quality of their labor and the effectiveness of each edition.

Inspired by the party's constant concern and attention, and aware of their high responsibility to the people, the collectives of publishing houses, the printers, and the distributors of publications deem it their duty to participate with even greater creative activeness and initiative in the implementation of the historical decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the ideological support of the plans for the building of communism.

GENIUS OF CRITICAL REALISM; WRITER'S CREATIVITY IN THE LIGHT OF LENIN'S ANALYSIS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 71-82

[Article by T. Motyleva, doctor of philological sciences]

[Text] Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy was born 150 years ago. On the year of his 80th birthday Vladimir Il'ich Lenin published in PROLETARIY, the Bolshevik newspaper, his famous article "Lev Tolstoy as a Mirror of the Russian Revolution."

Lenin considered Tolstoy one of his most favorite writers. Mentions and thoughts about the writer may be found in Vladimir Il'ich's works and letters starting with 1901. After Tolstoy's death Lenin continued his work on a cycle of articles on Tolstoy: Between the end of 1910 and beginning of 1911, one after another, the various organs of the Russian revolutionary press published Lenin's works "L. N. Tolstoy," "Is This Not the Beginning of a Turn?", "L. N. Tolstoy and the Contemporary Workers' Movement," "Tolstoy and the Proletarian Struggle," "Heroes of the 'Slander'," and "L. N. Tolstoy and his Time." They do not duplicate each other but, together, constitute an integral whole.

In various compact works Lenin discussed Tolstoy's personality and legacy, each time in connection with specific phenomena of the ideological and political struggle in Russia at the turn of the century. Taken together, however, these articles far exceed the limits of the specific reasons for their writing. They provide a general assessment of Tolstoy's life and works within the context of most modern Russian history and the historical destinies of the Russian Revolution.

Under the Soviet system Lenin's articles on Tolstoy became particularly widespread and familiar to millions of readers. Again and again, today we turn back to these works, considering them in the light of our time and of the new facts characterizing the fate of Tolstoy's legacy today.

At the time, Tolstoy's death touched profoundly Russian and world public opinion. The domestic and foreign press discussed him for several weeks on end. Thousands of people went to visit Tolstoy's grave in Yasnaya Polyana. Lenin followed very attentively the demonstrations, meetings, and strikes with which workers and students honored the memory of the deceased. This is precisely the topic of the article "Is This Not the Beginning of a Turn?".

Vladimir Il'ich noted very soberly that despite his entire popularity, Tolstoy the artist was known in Tsarist Russia, essentially, only by an insignificant minority. Nothing else was possible under conditions marked by almost total population illiteracy and bitter need. "In order to make his great works really accessible to all," Lenin emphasized, "we must struggle against the type of social system which has condemned millions and tens of millions of people to darkness, ignorance, slave labor, and poverty. A socialist coup d'etat is needed" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 20, p 19). He predicted that Tolstoy's works of art "will always be valuable and read by the masses once they have human living conditions having overthrown the yoke of landowners and capitalists . . ." (ibid, p 20).

After the October Revolution, when the oppression of the exploiters came to an end in Russia, life confirmed the accuracy of this prediction. In our country Tolstoy's works became truly national property. Lenin greatly contributed to this. V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich writes in his memoirs that "I frequently had the occasion to hear Vladimir Il'ich say that we must thoroughly review all of L. N. Tolstoy's works and, in addition to a complete academic edition, publish many of his stories, articles, and excerpts in individual pamphlets and booklets, and distribute them in hundreds of thousands of copies everywhere, among the peasants and the workers" (see "V. I. Lenin o L. N. Tolstom" [V. I. Lenin on L. N. Tolstoy], Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, Moscow, 1969, p 94). On Lenin's direct instruction work was undertaken on the publication of the complete collected works of L. N. Tolstoy, including everything he had written, not only novels, stories, plays, and articles, but diaries, letters, and rough drafts of artistic and publicistic works. Such a complete collected edition, consisting of 90 volumes, was published from 1928 to 1958 and became the base for subsequent editions of the writer's works domestically and abroad. This year the overall number of copies of Tolstoy's books published in the USSR will reach the tremendous figure of 200 million. The new collected works, in 22 volumes, whose publication was undertaken on the 150th anniversary of his birth, will broaden the range of his readers even further: Each volume will be published in one million copies. Tolstoy's works have been translated into 67 languages of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Today anyone who wishes to study more profoundly Tolstoy's life and works is in a far better situation compared with his contemporaries. We have at our disposal a number of materials which had not been published in his lifetime: Rough drafts, notebooks, diaries, letters to individuals (totalling 32 volumes in the complete collected works), recollections of members of

his family, and witness testimonies. Today we can read a great deal of items not accessible to Lenin at the turn of the century. However, reading the new publications which reveal Tolstoy's character ever more fully, occasionally with unexpected facets, we reach the conclusion that this material confirms and supports with new data the analysis of his outlook and work found in Lenin's articles.

In order to realize the major and extensive contribution which these articles were to the study of Tolstoy, we must see the way the works of the brilliant writer were assessed by contemporary Russian and foreign critics. The works triggered controversies in both Russia and abroad. The deployment of forces in such discussions is accurately defined in Lenin's works. The reactionaries began to persecute Tolstoy as a dangerous rebel and heretic even before the Tsarist "policemen in Christ" had excommunicated him. Liberals of various hues were enchanted with Tolstoy, proclaiming him a "great conscience," while carefully ignoring the specific and very sharp social questions he raised. The "miserable" Tolstoyans, the Menshevik-Revisionist "Heroes of the 'Slander'," praised the writer-philosopher by trying to raise to the level of a dogma precisely his weakest sides. To many of his contemporaries, literary workers, and "simple" readers who, without joining ideological debates admired the power of Tolstoy's artistic mastery, whether living or dead he remained a greatly mysterious personality.

In fact, how could a Russian aristocrat, the scion of the highest landowning nobility, break so drastically with the prevailing views of his environment and oppose the power of the haves? How could Tolstoy the artist combine inordinate love of life and spontaneous joy of living with the preaching of religious asceticism? How could a convinced Christian, the spokesman for charity, write so many merciless pages against the foundations of the then existing order, directly aimed, in particular, at orthodox church dogma? Critics and biographers were drowned in guesses.

To this day attempts are made in foreign works on Tolstoy to explain the contradictory nature of the writer exclusively in terms of individual character traits--willfulness, pride, eccentricities ascribed to genius, old age idiosyncrasies and, occasionally, even secrets of the irrational "Slavic soul." With such an approach to the artist and his personality and works, his entire life is inevitably denigrated and even distorted. Anything that is complex and hard to explain is reduced to simple hazard.

V. I. Lenin organized the study of Tolstoy on a historical and truly scientific basis. He understood and interpreted the writer by linking him with his times and the urgent vital problems which excited the majority of the people of the period. Tolstoy's doctrine, Lenin wrote, should be considered "not as something individual, not as whim or eccentricity, but as an ideology of the living conditions factually experienced by millions and millions of people over a certain period of time" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 20, p 103). "The contradictions found in Tolstoy's views are not contradictions merely of his individual mind but a reflection of the highly complex and contradictory

conditions, social phenomena, and historical traditions which defined the mentality of the various classes and strata within Russian society in both the post- and pre-revolutionary epoch" (ibid, p 22).

Tolstoy wrote his main works in the period, as Vladimir Il'ich recollected, between two turning points in Russian history--the abolishment of serfdom in 1861 and the 1905 revolution. Defining the characteristics of the period, Lenin cited Levin's words in "Anna Karenina": ". . . In our country now. . . . all this has been turned upside down and is only beginning to settle . . ." (ibid, p 100). Over a period of several decades important social changes took place in Russia, events which needed entire centuries to develop in Western Europe. Among all the countries in the world it was precisely Russia that was experiencing at that time the fastest and most intensive development of social relations. The Russian liberation movement rapidly involved in the orbit of its influence the huge strata of oppressed and exploited people, including uneducated and politically inexperienced ones. It was precisely in such historical conditions that Tolstoy's artistic genius developed and rose powerfully, and that his social and philosophical views were defined in which illusions and aspects of patriarchal naivete were conflictingly combined with deep and perspicacious visions. "Depicting this segment of Russian historical life," Lenin wrote, "L. Tolstoy . . . was able to reach such an artistic power that his works assumed one of the leading positions in world belles-lettres. Thanks to Tolstoy's brilliant interpretation, the epoch of preparations for a revolution in a country of suppressed serfs became a step forward in the artistic development of all mankind" (ibid, p 19).

Lenin's thesis of the close link between Tolstoy the artist and the social life of the epoch has been repeatedly confirmed by all we have discovered in recent decades on the inner world of the writer and his uninterrupted, dramatic, and intensive spiritual work. Reading and rereading Tolstoy's diaries, notebooks, and letters, and studying according to original sources, the creative history of his works, we see how sensitively he reacted to Russian and international events of the social and political life. Lev Nikolayevich was not in the least the Yasnaya Polyana hermit. He saw a number of people, representing various social strata, read periodicals in several languages, and received thousands of letters from the various parts of Russia and countries throughout the world. He could not remain indifferent either to the crying errors made in the command of the Tsarist army, which largely determined Russia's defeat in the Crimean War, the conflicts between peasants and landowners in the period of preparations for the 1861 Reform, the hunger in Samarskaya Guberniya in the poor harvest season of 1873, the situation of Negroes in America, or the colonial wars waged by the imperialist powers by the turn of the century. . . . Anything which concerned, pained, and puzzled Tolstoy's contemporaries, particularly in Russia, powerfully invaded the awareness of the writer, and was reflected in its way in his articles and treatises, novels, stories, and plays.

As a creative individual, Tolstoy is the best example of the description of the philosopher and artist he provided in his work "So, What Are We to Do?". "The philosopher and the artist will never rest calmly on their olympic heights as we have become accustomed to imagine them. The philosopher and the artist must suffer together with the people, in order to find either salvation or consolation. Furthermore, he must also suffer because he is always and eternally concerned and excited: He could resolve and state what would be good for the people, what would rescue them from suffering, or console them; yet, he may have not expressed or depicted this suitably. He may make no decision or statement yet tomorrow, perhaps, may be too late, he may be dead. For this reason suffering and self-assertion will always be the lot of the philosopher and the artist." Further on, with his characteristically uncompromising straightforwardness, Tolstoy says: There is no such thing as a smooth, playboy-type, and complacent philosopher and artist" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 99 volumes, Vol 25, p 373). He was firmly convinced of this.

A sensitive social conscience is a fixed quality of the truly great writer, philosopher, or man of culture. It is precisely this characteristic that, in the final account and in his own words, made Tolstoy "the attorney for the 100 million-strong farming people" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 volumes, Vol 76, p 45). This occurred in historical situations in which the mass of the Russian peasantry, suppressed by age-old landowners' oppression and, subsequently, plundered by newly established predatory capitalism, began to stir, became excited, and began to emerge in the arena with more or less independent historical action. Under those circumstances, as Lenin said, Tolstoy was able "to describe the mood of the broad masses oppressed by the present order with outstanding power, to depict their position, and to express their spontaneous leading of protest and indignation" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 20, p 20). He was also able to express their alienation from politics and from Christian-utopian delusions.

Lenin described this twin nature of the writer's outlook, whose strength and weakness were derived from the same source--a patriarchal-peasant awareness--in his article "Lev Tolstoy as the Mirror of the Russian Revolution," and in subsequent articles, with the help of sharp and expressive definitions. "Tolstoy reflected the brimming hatred and ripe aspiration for a better life and desire to get rid of the past, as well as immature dreams, political ignorance, and revolutionary spinelessness" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 17, p 212); "the protest of millions of peasants and their despair blended in Tolstoy's doctrine" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 20, p 40); "the great ocean of the people, excited to its very depths, with its weaknesses and all its strong aspects, was reflected in Tolstoy's doctrine" (ibid, p 71).

All of Lenin's articles on Tolstoy contain frank criticism of his religious-philosophical doctrine. ". . . Any attempt to idealize Tolstoy's doctrine, to justify or soften his 'non-resistance,' his appeals to the 'Spirit' and for 'moral self-perfection,' his doctrines of 'conscience' and universal 'love,' his sermons on asceticism and quietism, and so on," Lenin wrote, "can only be most directly and profoundly harmful" (ibid, p 104). As we

know, feelings of class peace and non-resistance to evil, practiced in 1905, frequently led to tragic consequences for the people. Let us recall the shooting by Tsarist troops at the peaceful workers' demonstration on 9 January. The articles on Tolstoy are within the range of Lenin's works in which the results of the defeated first Russian Revolution are critically interpreted from the positions of the preparations for a new revolution--a proletarian, a victorious revolution. Yet, Lenin highly respected Tolstoy's genius, finding in his books and philosophical and publicistic works a mercilessly sharp protest against social injustice, Tsarist arbitrariness, and church hypocrisy. Sometimes a note of protest could trigger a more lively response in the reader than a sermon of universal love. The so-called "Tolstoyans" or liberal and Menshevik defenders of the writer, are a different matter: They gave priority precisely to the doctrine of social passiveness, and to abstract appeals to kindness. The arrows of Lenin's criticism are aimed, above all, precisely at them, rather than at Tolstoy himself.

The essence and pathos of Lenin's articles are the assertion of Tolstoy's tremendous merits. Lenin does not speak for himself only. He refers to the collective opinion of the progressive proletariat. "The Russian workers in almost all big Russian cities have already reacted to L. N. Tolstoy's death and expressed, one way or another, their attitude toward the writer who left a number of most outstanding works of art placing him among the greatest writers in the world--an attitude toward the philosopher who raised with tremendous force, confidence, and sincerity, a number of problems related to the basic features of the contemporary political and social system" (ibid, p 38). Lenin most loudly proclaimed the universal importance of Tolstoy and Tolstoy's greatness and national traits as the source of this greatness.

Nevertheless, how did Count Tolstoy cross the line of his own class awareness, becoming the spokesman for the ideas and feelings of the oppressed popular and peasant masses? Lenin clearly describes the turn of mind which took place in Tolstoy under the influence of events in contemporary Russian life: "The sharp break of all the 'old pillars' of rural Russia sharpened his attention and increased his interest in what was happening around him, leading to a change in his entire outlook" (ibid, p 39).

Tolstoy himself gave testimony of the sharp change in his views which occurred at the beginning of the 1880's, above all in his "Confession." He wrote that "love for the real working people" saved him from total despair, giving his life a meaning. ". . . A change took place in me which had long been ripening within me and whose embryos had always been in me. What happened to me was that the life of our circle--the rich and the learned--not only became distasteful to me but lost all meaning. All our actions, views, science, and art, they all looked to me like over-indulgence. I realized that no meaning could be found in all this. The actions of the working people building life seemed to me as the only real matter. I understood that the meaning ascribed to this life is the truth and I accepted it" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 23, p 40). These lines carry an element of Tolstoy's frequent extremism. Breaking with his habitual views

and the norms of life of his environment, he tended to scratch off his own works and just about all existing literature and art of the times as "over-indulgence." Such paradoxes are frequent in Tolstoy's publicism. However, the stern evaluation of the ruling system, the desire to look at things with the eyes of the "working people creating life," were profoundly sincere feelings in him, consistent with the new principles he had adopted.

Tracing Tolstoy's life through original source, we see the type of active and responsive character he had. Even in periods of most intensive literary work, Lev Nikolayevich did not lock himself within strictly literary interests. The young Tolstoy shared privations, suffering, and danger with rank and file soldiers who defended Sebastopol. Subsequently, when Tolstoy became a professional writer, he was irresistibly attracted to practical activities for the people. During the peasant reform, as a laic mediator, he defended the interests of the peasants, triggering the displeasure of his class confreres. He developed his own innovational pedagogical system and applied it in the teaching of rural children at the Yasnaya Polyana School. Tolstoy founded Izdatel'stvo Posrednik which published booklets generally accessible to the broad masses. In the course of the census of the Moscow population, together with the rank and file census takers, he went into hovels and hospices where the poor huddled. In the poor harvest seasons of the 1890's the old and universally famous writer personally undertook to organize free kitchens for the hungry peasants, engaged, together with a small group of assistants, in the most prosaic low-level work, in all its economic details.

...

Tolstoy's letters enable us to see how much time and forces he dedicated to a great variety of unknown people, helping the needy, speaking out in the defense of victims of Tsarist terrorism, and instructing and supporting beginning writers. Truly, the writer's life was inseparable from "common life." All this influenced his views, and was characteristically reflected in his artistic creativity as well. For example, researchers have established the extent to which Tolstoy's individual contacts with revolutionary peasants enriched the novel "Resurrection" which describes political prisoners. One such peasant, Ye. Lazarev, was described by Tolstoy in the character of Nabatov. The correspondence and friendly contacts with Lazarev, visited by Lev Nikolayevich in the Butyrka Jail, helped him to depict the fate of the inmates accurately and with no embellishments (see L. N. Bol'shakov, "V Poiskakh Korrespondentov L'va Tolstogo" [The Search for Lev Tolstoy's Correspondents], Tula, 1974, pp 164-220).

Studies prove that Tolstoy's work, as a publicist and public figure, having particularly intensified in the last decades of his life, was closely linked by his intentions and attempts to engage in social work as he had intended in his youth. At this point, it would be pertinent to cite a specific example. His article "I Can Not Remain Silent" (1908) is widely known. This an impassionate protest against the execution of revolutionaries. However, the words "I Can Not Be Silent" were written by him 50 years previously, in a draft report which he, as an officer, intended to submit in 1855 to the

Tsarist government but was unable to do so by virtue of existing circumstances. In this note Tolstoy expressed his strong support of the rightless and humiliated soldiers: "Because of my oath of allegiance and, even more so, as a man I can not ignore the evil which is openly committed in front of me and which clearly takes to their doom millions of people--the doom of strength, dignity, and honor of the fatherland" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 4, pp 285-286). Already in his young years he could not remain silent and, in his own way, tried to become an active participant in civic life. The change in his views was no accident but was prepared by previous developments.

All this makes us consider, again and again, the title of the first article in Lenin's cycle: "Lev Tolstoy as the Mirror of the Russian Revolution." The Leninist analysis clearly shows the complex and dialectical refraction with which the writer, without being a revolutionary himself, perceived and transmitted through his work the spirit of the peasant liberation movement at the historical divide between two centuries and two epochs of Russian life. However, occasionally foreign critics interpret the word "mirror" in a way as though the Marxists consider artistic creativity the passive reproduction of reality. In fact, the Leninist theory of reflection does not treat the reflection of life in the mind but, specifically, of life in art as a mirror copy. Art, born on the basis of reality, has itself an influence on it. Such was the case with Tolstoy's works as well. His works, particularly, "The Death of Ivan Il'ich," "Power of Darkness," and "Resurrection," awakened the awareness of the readers and created doubts in the strength of the exploiting system. Today we have the testimony of a number of progressive foreign writers of the power with which Tolstoy's books awakened a critical, occasionally rebellious, thinking among the reading public not only in Russia but far beyond it. This is confirmed, for example, by one of the oldest masters of German anti-fascist literature, Heinrich Mann: "When the unique Tolstoy wrote his 'Anna Karenina,' he himself had not as yet clearly realized that a society which could be seen in such a way had no longer the right to a long existence." In this connection Mann gave "Resurrection," "Kreuzer's Sonnets," and the folktale "Does Man Need a Great Deal on Earth," as examples of the "stubborn truthfulness" inherent in Russian classical literature (see Heinrich Mann, "Ein Zeitalter wird besichtigt" [An Age Will Be Inspected], Berlin u. Weimar, 1973, pp 48-52).

However remote Tolstoy might have been from the revolutionary movement, he was convinced that Russia was on the threshold of big changes and that the Russian popular masses will have their say in history.

Tremendous respect for the working people and belief in their strength is the motif which runs through Tolstoy's works written at different times. In one of his early pedagogical articles, the author's criticism of the "privileged society," is backed by the following remark: "... We ignore the voice of the one who attacks us. We ignore it because it does not appear in the press or the university. Yet, this is the powerful voice of the people which must be listened to" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 8,

p 220). In the unfinished novel "Decembrists," returning to Moscow after a long Siberian exile, Labazov, the revolutionary-aristocrat thinks out loud: "The people--the peasants--have risen incomparably. They have acquired a greater awareness of their dignity. . . . I believe that Russia's strength lies not in us but in the people" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 17, p 30). A consideration of the toiling masses as the motive, the decisive force of national history, is the base of the epic novel "War and Peace." Its main characters--Andrey Bolkonskiy, Pierre Bezukhov, and Natasha Rostova--show new facets of their characters, truly find themselves, and become part of the nationwide exploit. Andrey Bolkonskiy is killed at the Borodino battlefield but the memory of him will live for many years in his son, the future Decembrist. We find in the rough drafts of "War and Peace" outstanding formulas concisely presenting the very nature of the described events. "Our success is the success of the soldier, the muzhik, the people . . . ," Bolkonskiy says ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 13, p 36). One of the versions of the epilogue reads: "A terrible invasion is rushing eastward, reaching its final objective--Moscow. A new and totally unknown force rises--the people--and the invasion is doomed" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 15, p 206). It is precisely this view of history and of Russia's destiny that ascribes patriotism this particular quality which imbues Tolstoy's epic, determining its innovational structure based on the involvement of private destinies in the broad stream of popular life, together with a unique poetic coloring. That was precisely why the reading of "War and Peace" gave Lenin the idea which he shared in a conversation with Gor'kiy: "Until that Count came along there was no real muzhik in literature" ("V. I. Lenin o Literature i Iskusstve" [V. I. Lenin on Literature and Art], Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, Moscow, 1976, p 639).

One can not seriously consider Tolstoy's originality as a master of the language without seeing the profound influence which the popular, the peasant way of thinking had not only on the ideological structure of his books, but their style and esthetic nature.

Here again let us recall Lenin's definitions: " . . . Most sober realism. . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 17, p 209); "the reason for which Tolstoy's criticism stands out with such powerful feelings, passion, convincingness, freshness, sincerity, and fearlessness in the desire 'to reach the roots,' and find the real reason for the misfortunes of the masses is that this criticism truly reflects the change in the views of millions of peasants" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 20, p 40).

In fact, even though one of the best educated people of his time, a person who had absorbed a tremendous book culture and the experience of world art of different epochs, in his work as a writer Tolstoy was largely oriented toward the collective wisdom of the people and their oral works. He tried to break down enduring literary cliches and develop within himself and express in his books a sober, fresh view on things, not dulled by any type of convention. The people's way of looking at the world and the live folk style helped him, as an artist, to reach "the roots."

Tolstoy's diaries and notebooks directly reflect his constant personal contacts with the peasants. Tolstoy's notebooks and diaries are noteworthy also from the viewpoint of another and essentially even more important aspect. They provide brief descriptions of a number of human destinies, characters, and biographies of peasants or apprentices. Each brief entry is a cluster of popular bitterness and, sometimes, insult and hard to conceal anger. It is as though such notes reveal the concealed psychological mechanism of the change which took place in Tolstoy: He found unbearable the role of a passive witness to the people's misfortunes. "At Kostyushka's. Clean hut. Spinning wheels on the shelf along the left wall. . . . A tow with sacking cotton. No sheep. A torn caftan. Two girls--one of them curled up on the stove. 'I wish those would die too. All of them need clothes and shoes'" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 48, p 308). " . . . He was the son of a salesman and himself a salesman. He borrowed (700 rubles) from a comrade. Failed to repay on time, the lender called the note, he was ruined, took to drinking, became depressed, wanted to commit suicide, turned to prayer. Ready to become a worker" (ibid, p 311). One more: "After lunch went to Yasenka. A 16 year old youngster and a 60 year old man were cutting stone. For food. Hard rock. Slave labor from early morning to late evening. Petr Osipov expressed his sympathy for the revolutionaries. He said: 'Your servants as well have atoned for their sins. They should be told of the services performed by their ancestors'" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 49, p 103).

Tolstoy did not have to share this "sympathy for the revolutionaries" expressed by some of his anonymous collocutors. Obviously, however, he did not consider the oppressed peasant masses merely a subject for compassion. On numerous occasions he was aware of the sharp contrast between the pitiful and degraded position of the people and the great possibilities they concealed. In the spring of 1892, residing in Begichevka Village where he engaged in practical help to the hungry, L. N. Tolstoy wrote the following to critic N. N. Strakhov: "One feels useful and that one's participation, even though small, is needed. There are good times but mostly, plunging deep within the people, it is painful to see the degradation and degeneracy to which they have been brought. Yet, they still want to control and teach them. They take up man, turn him into a drunk, rob him, tie him and throw him in a garbage pit and then, pointing out his position, say that he can not achieve anything by himself and that is what he becomes when left to himself and, using this as a pretext, continue to keep him in slavery. If they would but for one year stop dealing with him, stupifying him, plundering and chaining him, they could see what he could do and achieve the type of prosperity of which you could not even dream" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 66, pp 204-205).

In the older Tolstoy's letters and diaries we come across yet another essential idea: Sadness caused by the troubles experienced by the working and oppressed people, combined with a painfully growing discontent with himself and doubts in the veracity of his own doctrine. Thus, on 26 July 1896, Tolstoy wrote in his diary: "I went to Baburino yesterday and

unwittingly (I would have rather avoided than looked out for him) met 80 year old Akim the plowman, the old Yaremichev who has no overcoat and a single caftan, and then Mar'ya, whose husband froze and who has no one to harvest her rye and whose child is dying, and Trofim and Khalyavka, both man and wife and their children dying. Yet, we discuss Beethoven and pray God to save us from this life. Once again I pray, I shriek in pain. I can not become entangled, bind myself, but I hate myself and my life" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 53, p 102). Many such admissions are found in the diaries of his final years. "Painful awareness of the baseness of my life among people who work barely to save themselves from cold and hungry death, to save themselves and their families. . . . Painfully shameful, horrible. Yesterday I walked by the stonecutters as if punished" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 58, p 37). In other admissions, the more he went on the less could Tolstoy be satisfied with his own "prescriptions" for rescuing humanity through universal kindness and non-resistance of evil. Frequently his thoughts on religious-moral topics are interrupted by remarks such as, "everything is very unclear and bad" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 55, p 46); "everything has been badly recorded" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 56, p 33); "the mind is not sufficiently clear to go on" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol. 57, p 121).

Reading all this we can see more clearly the origins of the spiritual drama which made Tolstoy suffer so much in his old age. The reasons which made him leave Yasnaya Polyana, and the circumstances he found unbearable, circumstances which, perhaps, speeded up his death or, in any case, darkened his last days, may not ever be reduced to the family conflict about which observers and biographers have written hundreds of pages. Tolstoy's spiritual drama was the result of a complex interaction among different factors, biographic and historical. Most important here is the development, the extreme aggravation of the "shrieking contradictions" whose essence was discovered by Lenin.

The complex situation in which Tolstoy parted with life and the bitter thoughts which were recorded in his works, diaries, and letters, particularly those of his final years, have all been frequently subject of misinterpretations abroad.

Whereas some writers and scientists declare Tolstoy to be an excessively optimistic writer, in harmony with his perception of the world and, therefore, ageless, others, conversely, try to relate his spiritual legacy with the concepts of total pessimism which have currently become widespread in the West. Such is precisely the spirit in which the novel "The Death of Ivan Il'ich" was interpreted by M. Heidegger, the German existentialist philosopher, decades ago. Occasionally Western literary experts compare, on the same level, Tolstoy with F. Kafka. References are also made to A. Camus' view who, in an interview granted the newspaper LES NOUVELLES LITTERAIRES (10 May 1951) said that Tolstoy "carries within himself concern and a tragic meaning."

Naturally, the great writer-humanist was concerned with the suffering of contemporary mankind. He exposed the slavery of hired labor such as, for example, in the familiar article "Slavery in our Time." He was concerned with the growth of militarism and the danger presented by ruinous wars. He also soberly saw the threat to any living development presented by capitalist industry and urbanization. He opposed the power of his genius to evil precisely because he did not consider evil inevitable and invincible. Understandably, Tolstoy could not fail to reflect the tragic aspects of human life. However, he sharply condemned--in his treatise "What Is Art?" and other works--the decadent outlook based on fatelessness, abstract sorrow, and meaninglessness of life. Rejecting the unspiritual existence of a parasitical upper-crust, he also rejected the system of ideas according to which human life had no meaning to begin with.

Tolstoy continues to charm his readers with the rare power of his optimism which is found in the very atmosphere of his books, in his way of looking at the world, in his depiction of nature and in his favorite characters. Let us recall the captivating Natasha Rostova and the exclamation of the young Nikolay Rostov: "Long live the entire world!" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." in 90 Volumes, Vol 9, p 156). A stubborn optimistic energy imbues even one of Tolstoy's latest works--the story "Khadzhi Murat." The result of the writer's creative life is not a sermon preaching despair and a passive attitude and, naturally, not a thoughtless gaiety, but a courageously sober view of the world, and moral concern caused by the difficulties and evils from which mankind must rescue itself and, with them, unabated faith in human strength.

Tolstoy achieved universal fame in the mid-1880's, at the peak of his creative power. His glory rose in the course of the final decades of his life and continued to do so after his death. Today Tolstoy is one of the most widely known and read writers in all continents.

Many great writers of the 20th Century have learned and are learning from Tolstoy. The masters of literature which have attended his school, in one or another sense and to one or another extent, and have witnessed in articles or books their attachment to him include not only Gor'kiy, Sholokov and other most outstanding masters of the multi-national Soviet literature, but Anatole France, Romain Rolland, Roger Martin du Gard, John Galsworthy, Bernard Shaw, Thomas Wolfe, Ernest Hemingway, Gerhart Hauptmann, Thomas Mann, Stephan Zeromskiy, Nazym Hikmet, as well as our famous contemporaries such as, for example, Anna Seghers, Jaroslaw Iwaszkiewicz, and Alecho Carpentier.

Each one of these writers, naturally, perceived Tolstoy's creative legacy in his own way. In all of them the tradition stemming from Tolstoy interacts with the national traditions of their countries, individual inclinations, and talent. The foreign prose masters learn from Tolstoy--the author of "War and Peace," "Anna Karenina," and "Resurrection"--the art of the novel and the principles of structuring a big epic narration which covers a number of human destinies and penetrates into the very core of the social, ideological, and moral problems of the depicted epoch. As early as the 19th Century

playwrights and theater workers learned from Tolstoy's "Power of Darkness" how to present on the stage people from the bottoms, and discuss on stage particularly painful life conflicts in a language understood by the masses. From Tolstoy the psychologist writers learn how to reach the "dialectics of the soul," the inner world of man in his multi-dimensional nature and complex movements. It would be difficult to enumerate the specific artistic discoveries made by Tolstoy found in present-day literature in their transformed aspect and in a variety of national and individual variations.

Tolstoy has had and is having a powerful influence on the art of writing. However, in no case is his importance to our time limited to art. Yes, a great deal of Tolstoy's philosophy has irrevocably become part of the past; even during his lifetime his contradictory and utopian moral-religious doctrine was accepted unreservedly by a very small circle of people. However, Tolstoy's ideological legacy contains something ageless, something of permanent value to mankind. Tolstoy's impassionate opposition to social injustice and the exploitation of man by man, his condemnation of aggressive wars and colonialism, his sharp criticism of social hypocrisy and lies in their various even most widespread and commonplace manifestations and, more than that, Tolstoy's very formulation of the "great problems" of social life and human morality made and are still making a deep impression on thinking readers. The writer or the man of culture, or, generally, a person exercising any kind of profession who has accepted this Tolstoyan legacy can no longer remain indifferent to social life or not feel a share of responsibility for anything happening throughout the world.

After Tolstoy's death Lenin wrote: "His universal importance as an artist and his world fame as a philosopher and preacher both reflect, in their own way, the universal importance of the Russian Revolution" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 20, p 19). At that time such a claim might have seemed paradoxical to intellectuals in Russia and the West who read Tolstoy with interest while displaying an indifferent or skeptical attitude toward the revolutionary movement. The Great October Socialist Revolution confirmed Lenin's thesis: Even skeptics realized the tremendous universal-historical significance of that Revolution which was prepared and had its "dress rehearsal" in 1905 and was due to a large extent to Tolstoy's fiery words, as he helped with the entire power of his artistic genius and sober critical realism to weaken the foundations of Tsarism and the power of Russia's exploiting classes.

This Leninist thesis was confirmed in a more specific, directly literary aspect. It also became obvious that the reading of Tolstoy trained many noted foreign writers and men of culture for a spiritual rapprochement with Soviet Russia. In his poem "Greetings of a German Poet to the Russian Federal Soviet Republic," Johannes Becher, the German revolutionary poet, also spoke of "Tolstoy's legacy" (Johannes R. Becher, "Gesammelte Werke" [Collected Works], Vol 2, Berlin u. Weimar, 1966, p 19). After the October Revolution Tolstoy's young Western literary confreres--Bernard Shaw, Anatole France, and, particularly, Romain Rolland--became loyal friends of the Soviet State. In 1931 Romain Rolland wrote: "I continued Tolstoy's stern criticism

of a society and art for the privileged . . . I welcomed the news of the Russian Revolution the moment it reached me" ("Sobr. Soch." [Collected Works], Vol 13, Moscow, 1958, p 211).

What could the progressive writers of our epoch learn from Tolstoy? Anna Seghers answered the question. Fighting for peace, she wrote, "we learn from Tolstoy's works how to influence the people, how to speak a language understood by the entire people . . . his language grew from his knowledge of people, from his irrefutable knowledge of their living conditions. He spoke the language of a fighter for peace not because he was a Tolstoyan but despite it. As a powerful artist-realist, he showed what in man was human and worth loving--his dignity, his work, his homeland, and his children. He described who scorns the dignity of man and who and what threatens it. He showed this by taking Russian people as examples but with such shining clarity that their humaneness breaks down all barriers; that is precisely why today people, whether white, yellow, or black, honor the memory of the great Russian artist" (Anna Seghers, "Über Tolstoi. Über Dostojewskij" [On Tolstoy. On Dostoyevskiy], Berlin, 1963, pp 19-20).

The works of Tolstoy, one of the greatest artistic geniuses of mankind, are precious to the peoples the world over. They are particularly precious and close to the working people of our socialist world. Lenin's words are coming true: There is in Tolstoy's heritage "something which has not gone into the past, which belongs to the future."

5003

CSO: 1802

'MASTER OF LIVING ART. . . .'; ROMAIN ROLLAND

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 83-87

[Article by V. Sedykh, Paris-Moscow, August 1978]

[Text] Documents which inform us of new details of Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy's life and work were kindly presented to the editors by the widow of the great French writer Romain Rolland. This summer, during a trip to Paris, I had the occasion to visit several times this rarely energetic woman, considering her age, in her small modest apartment on Boulevard Montparnasse. The Rolland couple had rented the apartment on the very eve of World War Two. Mariya Pavlovna had just prepared for publication the 25th consecutive volume of "Romain Rolland's Notebooks," entirely dedicated to Lev Tolstoy and aimed at the 150th anniversary of his birth.

"From an early age to his last day Romain Rolland revered the genius of Lev Tolstoy to whom he dedicated hundreds of outstanding pages," Mariya Pavlovna said, presenting me with copies of as yet unpublished works by her husband.

In the spring of 1887 20-year old Rolland, a student at the Ecole Normale Supérieure in Paris addressed an impassionate letter to the author of "War and Peace." In his message the youngster described his "passionate wish to learn how to live." "It is only from you alone," he said, addressing himself to Lev Tolstoy, "that I could expect an answer, for you are the only one who has raised questions which give me no rest."

In October of the same year the world famous writer answered the young Frenchman, probably sensing a curious mind and a pure soul. He answered in a lengthy --28 pages!--letter addressing him as "Dear Brother!"

Publishing this answer many years later, with his own preface, Rolland emphasized that "the goodness, intelligence, and absolute truthfulness of this great man made me consider him the most reliable guide in the moral anarchy of our time."

In 1911 Romain Rolland published his famous work "The Life of Tolstoy." This outstanding work opened with the admission that "Tolstoy--the great Russian soul, a light which shone on earth 100 years ago--illuminated the youth of my generation. In the stifling twilights of the vanishing century he became our guiding star; our young hearts turned to him; he was our shelter."

This study emphasized, in particular, that Lev Tolstoy was a tireless fighter against lies and that he persecuted all "religious and social prejudices, superstitions, and fetishes," and exposed "the harm of the old official pillars of the church-persecutor and Tsarist autocracy." Nevertheless, it was Lenin's brilliant works that helped Romain Rolland understand fully the entire complexity of Lev Tolstoy's work.

In his 1934 article "Lenin--Art and Action," extensively citing from the classical work "Lev Tolstoy as the Mirror of the Russian Revolution," Rolland wrote that Lenin described the way the great Russian writer "exposed with brilliant power the lies and crimes of the social order of his day. His criticism in itself was an appeal to revolution. Yet, faced with revolutionary action, necessarily stemming from that same criticism, the writer runs aside in fear and anger . . ."

The discrepancy in Lev Tolstoy's views is reflected also in the excerpts from Romain Rolland's "Diary" which follows. The author of "War and Peace" is frequently mentioned in it.

"I retain my entire admiration of Lev Tolstoy and my entire love for him of my youth," Rolland wrote in 1935. "I shall never forget the fatherly help he gave to the uncertain youngster I was then. I consider him the greatest master of life in art, a master of the art of living. . . . I imagine him like Jean-Jacques Rousseau, sitting on the ruins of the old world, to whose destruction he contributed, and at the threshold of the new world, whose advent he had prepared, without wishing it, for which reason he had to go on, leaving it behind."

From Romain Rolland's Diary

End of October 1911

. . . . I receive many letters on the subject of my books, but I shy from quoting them. The reason for which I am transcribing a letter here is not only because it flatters my self-esteem as a writer but because it touches me, for the praise comes from the Tolstoy family. Its author is Tolstoy's eldest daughter Tat'yana Sukhotina (Blagodatnoye, Tul'skaya Guberniya, 8-20 October, 1911):

"Sir, I have just finished reading your book 'The Life of Tolstoy' (Vie de Tolstoi)¹ and would like you to know how high I value it. I am confident that my father would have been deeply touched by your extensive studies and clear understanding not only of his work but his entire being and this is

the highest praise I could give to your book. It made me cry on a number of occasions. Feelings of joy, gratitude, and emotion took over me thinking that my father could be so well understood by a person so different from him in age, nationality, education, and environment (and speaking a foreign language). How sorry I am that my imperfect French prevents me from expressing everything I would have liked to . . . I am sending you my copy of the book in which I have made a few notes. They could be useful to you in a new edition. I beg of you, however, to return it to me once you will no longer need it. Once again, sir, please accept my profound gratitude. . . .

Tat'yana Sukhotina

. . . . Do you know that my father spelled out his name 'Tolstoy' with a small 'y'? Following a trip to France he changed it to a 'i.' However, one of his relatives, Countess Aleksandra Tolstaya put him to shame, saying that ever since the 'Tolstoy' family has existed, the Russians have spelled it in French with a 'y.' Since then, following father's example, we have spelled it 'Tolstoy'."

14 January 1912

Lunch at Charles Salomon's, with Daniel Halevy and Mikhail Stakhovich,² Duma and State Council member, and one of Tolstoy's closest friends, 50 years old. Met Tolstoy in 1880. Shares neither Tolstoy's social nor religious ideas (he crosses himself before and after meals). However, Tolstoy liked him very much. He is a conservative. Seeing peasants mowing grass, he told his Duma colleagues, "let us go mow with them!" Taking off his jacket, he gave the example. Together with Tolstoy and the painter Gay, circa 1890 walked from Moscow to Yasnaya Polyana (200 kilometers), taking five or six days, keeping a diary throughout the journey. One evening, in a coaching inn, watching him write, Tolstoy asked him: "Are you continuing to write your clauses?" (Repeating after an old cossack in his famous novel, in which, seeing Tolstoy write, the kosak told him: "Throw away your clauses! Let us go hunt for pheasant.") Stakhovich recalls that, the last night, waking up at 11 p.m. or sometime near midnight (on the eve he had been dead tired), he saw that Tolstoy as well was writing something; at first he did not understand what Tolstoy was doing. Later on, he realized through his drugged sleep, that an old man in his 70's, who was sharing with them the room, was telling him stories; Stakhovich read two of them several years later in the "Power of Darkness": A story about a girl kidnapped by soldiers, and an interpretation of the word "bank." He says that Tolstoy was terribly angry at the respectful tone of voice with which people unwittingly addressed him. "Great writer of the Russian land," he recalled with comic indignation (from Turgenev's deathbed letter). Occasionally he said: "The great land of the Russian writer". . . . He went to you, arms akimbo, head raised high. he dragged his words like a person without teeth since the age of 35 or 36. He loved to laugh and laughed heartily. He had polite old-fashioned manners but he frequently lost control in conversation, after which he would ask forgiveness: "Shameful, shameful," he would say, "I am

ashamed, I shouted, I am ashamed of what I told you!" Several hours later he would go back to this but, afterwards, everything would start over and over again.

The last will which Chertkov³ made him draw up bothered him to his very end. Several weeks before his escape from Yasnaya he made Stakhovich promise to come to see him in November to discuss this with him and Tat'yana. Even though he had long considered his death, everything took place suddenly and irrevocably, like all decisions he had made throughout his life. After implementing a decision he never questioned its correctness. (Stakhovich backed this with a number of examples: Tolstoy's marriage, the writing of "War and Peace," and "Anna Karenina," and the refusal to complete the "Decembrists." It seems to me, however, that the story of the last will somewhat contradicts this statement.) . . .

How free, human, and lacking all stiffness and strain his rich character was! Even his most categorical assertions left some room for human and paradox. He did not try to lock himself within the boundaries of a fixed thought. He wrote about anything he thought but also forgot everything he wrote; he was not bothered in the least by disagreements with himself. When this was pointed out to him he would ask, "did I really say this? . . . That may be so, but I have said many other things as well!"

Yet, Chertkov enjoyed Tolstoy's consideration partially because of the narrow and inflexible straightness of his thinking. He once said laughingly: "Here is a good story for the Tolstoyans. This morning I have already summoned a priest to a dying man and advised a young man to become a soldier." Once, at dinner, in Yasnaya Polyana, some kind of delegation entered the garden. He walked to them. He came back: "Dancers from the opera. They have moral doubts. They would like to leave their profession. I asked them: 'Do you have families?' 'Yes.' 'If you abandon your craft could you make a living?' 'No.' 'Then, dear friends, go back to Moscow and keep dancing.'"

He adored Molière. He pitted him against Shakespeare as an example of true natural art. (Actually, he was unwilling to publish his work on Shakespeare. Chertkov talked him into it seven or eight years after he had written the book.) He rocked with laughter, reading, or being read to, Guy de Mopassan (such as "Cursed Bread," for example); he translated into Russian the story "On the Shore." . . . He liked the ideas of Dumas-Son very much. About him he said: This is a wise man (in the practical sense). Salomon gave him Gide's book "The Prodigal Son." He found it unbearable. Out of conscientiousness, since Salomon admired Gide, he reread it and found the novel even more intolerable. Yet, he was ecstatic at Pierre Mill's book which he had also received from Salomon, "Wounded Doe." He asked that some of the stories in the book be read to him two to three times a week. He noted only a few errors in the observations.

The prevailing idea notwithstanding, the text of his manuscripts was never final. He brought to the point of despair the publishers of his "Sebastopol Stories," the galleys of which he returned almost entirely reedited. At the

time he was selling . . . his manuscript "Cossacks," the publisher dickered not for money but for the galleys to be proofed by him, the publisher, rather than Tolstoy (and Tolstoy was so saddened to see in print something which he was unable to correct that he was unwilling to publish the "Cossacks," sequel even though it had already been written). The second part of "Cossacks" will soon be published in his "Posthumous Works." The third part is missing. He even rewrote, for his own pleasure, an entirely new draft of "Anna Karenina." (The only copy containing not only innumerable corrections but four or five new episodes is in a Russian museum.)⁴ The changes he made apply less to style than to content. It was essentially characters and events that were expanded. He was not interested in style or, to be more specific, he did not trust it. He said that style is always a writer's temptation. Everyone has his sin. The artist's sin is style. He frequently mentioned his profound scorn for poets (yet some poetry made him ecstatic with his typical splendid illogicity). Talking young Stakhovitch out of writing poetry, he told him: "One must write only when it becomes impossible not to write. One must write only when one is certain that he could tell the people something useful. If you run to help someone on the street you would not tie up your feet for pleasure. This is the case of poetry. You have something to say? Say it simply." He preferred Hugo's prose (he liked him a great deal)--"Les Miserables"--to his poetry. To Hugo's poetry he preferred that of Musset. He said a great deal of good and bad things about Pushkin. It was a few of Pushkin's lines . . . that gave him the idea of the very simple beginning of "Anna Karenina." (The only occasion on which he began to write at 5 p.m. He always wrote in the morning.) . . .

Tolstoy did not like critics and never varied in his rejection of them to the end of his life. . . . He said (there is something paradoxical in this essentially true claim) that the importance of an artist is determined by the number of his readers. The greatest artist is the one who is most read. As to art critics, he received bundles of art journals (which he never sought). They remained on his desk untouched. Once he heard a five year old girl, visiting him, leafing through a journal and describing the pictures to her nurse. The little girl was saying: "This is a dog, trees, a stream, soldiers, a woman washing herself . . . sheep, a mill, a woman washing herself . . . pears on a plate, a woman washing herself . . ." There was this "woman washing herself" page after page. Intrigued, finally Tolstoy could not resist: "What is this girl looking at?" He walked to the girl and saw simply statues of nude women. The little girl who was looking at the landscapes and scenes of daily life and was describing them in detail was, at this point, not even paying attention to this "woman" and, bored, would skip the page. "That is it!" Tolstoy exclaimed. "This is real criticism! The child expressed everything perfectly. . . . In fact, what is there here that is simple and healthy other than a woman washing herself?"

I forgot to mention that, in the course of his walk from Moscow to Yasnaya Polyana, together with Stakhovich, every evening, stopping in a peasant hut, Tolstoy would read to the peasants one of his folktales (without acknowledging its authorship).

"It is a big world," was a favorite expression of his which meant "outside of home, on the high roads." It was precisely those roads that Tolstoy took when he wanted to learn something new. "Here they know everything," said he.
....

From "Romain Rolland's Notebooks." Romain Rolland to Jean Gehennot⁵

Villeneuve, 5 November 1933

Dear Friend!

The 10th anniversary of Lenin's death comes on 21 January 1934. Would it be possible for EUROPE to publish an article on this anniversary in its January or February issue? Since the Leningrad Academy of Sciences asked me to write an article,⁶ I am ready to submit immediately (to you as well) an outline.

It is likely that I will find something to say about "Lenin and Tolstoy," since Lenin wrote several articles on Tolstoy. Perhaps EUROPE could publish the translation of one of these articles with some notes. However, since I am very busy with other things, I can not write this article within the next month. Let me add that (this publication) would unwittingly describe Lenin inadequately. It would be desirable for someone to describe him as a man of action.

Very sincerely yours,
Romain Rolland.

FOOTNOTES

1. The French title is included, for, later, the French spelling of the Tolstoy family will be discussed--editors' note.
2. In 1908 M. Stakhovich was secretary of the committee in charge of the celebration of Lev Tolstoy's 80th birthday--editors' note.
3. V. Chertkov was Lev Tolstoy's secretary and biography--editors' note.
4. At that time Romain Rolland was not quite fully aware of L. N. Tolstoy's manuscript legacy and the creative history of his works, for which reason his entry is somewhat inaccurate--editors' note.
5. Jean Gehennot was the editor of the periodical EUROPE--editors' note.
6. It is a question of Romain Rolland's famous article "Lenin--Art and Action"--editors' note.

5003

CSO: 1802

ALONG THE ROAD MAPPED OUT AT HELSINKI

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 88-99

[Article by Yu. Dubinin and Yu. Rakhmaninov]

[Text] The policy of the Soviet Union toward the capitalist states is based on the struggle for the assertion of the principles of peaceful coexistence, lasting peace and abating and, in the future, eliminating the danger of the outbreak of a new world war.

Naturally, the reactionary circles in the capitalist world oppose the improvement of the international circumstances. However, the changed ratio of forces in favor of socialism, and the increased influence on the course of world history of the socialist comity and the dynamic foreign policy pursued by the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact members, the successes of international communist, workers' and national-liberation movements, and, finally, the awareness of the new realities on the part of some state leaders in the capitalist countries give great strength to detente. The purposeful implementation of the Peace Program, formulated at the 24th and developed at the 25th CPSU congresses, has brought about tangible good changes in the life of mankind.

Our party and Soviet state are pursuing the Leninist peace course firmly and steadfastly. Neither zigzags in U.S. policy, endangering the cause of peace, nor the provocatory expansionistic course charted by the Peking leadership would turn the Soviet people away from this path. In the face of recently intensified attacks on the policy of peaceful coexistence, the Soviet leadership stated most firmly that our country shall refuse the invitation to join the grave diggers of detente and of the hopes of millions of people for a peaceful future, or of the possibility to ensure social progress and a life worthy of man and his children.

The most tangible positive results were achieved in Europe. This is entirely natural, for it is precisely here that the influence of socialist forces is the strongest. It was on the European continent that the first breach was made on the cold war front. The success of the meeting between Comrade

L. I. Brezhnev and other Soviet leaders and de Gaulle, the French president, in 1966, laid the beginning of the countdown for detente. The change in relations between the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, on the one hand, and the FRG, on the other, was a major international event. The Soviet-West German 1970 Treaty became one of the cornerstones of detente. Changes for the better took place also in relations between the USSR and the other European capitalist countries.

It was here, on European soil, that the fraternal socialist countries launched the initiative of holding a historically unprecedented meeting in favor of security and cooperation--the European Conference. The long and difficult struggle for the implementation of this initiative was crowned by the outstanding success reached in the summer 1975 in Helsinki in the course of a broad summit meeting of representatives of 33 European countries, the United States, and Canada.

Since the familiar decisions made by the allies no single post-war collective action had been linked in the minds of the nations with such great expectations as the European Conference. This had its profound reasons. Europe is one of the greatest centers of human civilization. Yet, it is also a continent of tragic military upheavals. Scientists have frequently counted the number of wars waged in Europe. In our time, assuming the scale of world catastrophes, such wars bore the threat of assuming a sinister cyclical nature whose duration, it seemed, would be merely sufficient for a new generation of soldiers' masses to grow up. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said from the Helsinki rostrum, "here, in Europe, aggressors frequently crowned themselves without 'laurels,' after which they were cursed by the peoples. Here, in Europe, aspirations to world rule were raised to the level of political doctrine, ending with the defeat of countries whose resources were put on the service of criminal man-hating objectives."

The peoples expected the necessary conclusions to be drawn from this historical experience, with complete awareness of the responsibility for the future of the European continent which must exist and develop in peace.

Let us see the extent to which these expectations have been justified, what was accomplished three years ago, and the development of events from that time one.

I.

The necessary political results of World War Two were summed up and the inviolability of existing borders was asserted at the European Conference. Its participants formulated a set of principles governing intergovernmental relations. This created favorable conditions for the preservation and strengthening of the peace on the entire continent. Turned toward the future, the conference results opened possibilities for peaceful cooperation in a number of areas--economics, science and technology, culture, information, and the development of contacts among people.

The conference became an event of tremendous historical significance and an important landmark in the struggle for rescuing Europe from wars, giving this continent a new face, and turning it into a continent of lasting peace, guaranteed safety, and fruitful cooperation. Its success was enthusiastically welcomed by the participating countries and people of goodwill of the areas directly adjacent to Europe as well as throughout the world.

At the same time, the success of the conference struck at the sinister forces of the cold war, revenge, and reaction. In an effort to cast aspersions on the European forum, the representatives of these forces did not hesitate to christen its results or, in other words, that which had been officially acknowledged and signed by the heads of their countries, as "capitulation," or a "new Munich." They blamed the diplomats of their own countries for, allegedly, having failed to haggle to the end and extract from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries certain concessions which, as conceived by the reactionaries, should have consisted of acquiring the right to interfere in the domestic affairs of other countries. These forces fought a lost battle and lived an unattainable dream and their actions only emphasized the importance of what had occurred in Helsinki.

Addressing recently a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, A. A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of foreign affairs, described the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe as a document "unprecedented in the history of international relations," holding a "special position among international documents." The fact that the final act was signed at the highest level on behalf of all 35 participating countries gave its clauses the nature of authoritative reciprocal obligations.

The three years which have passed since the conclusion of the Final Act are too short a time for a document containing a program aimed at many years, decades, perhaps, into the future. Yet, this is also a time long enough to show that the results of the conference represent a valuable gain for all participating countries, proving the realistic possibility of the practical implementation of these results.

Today we have full reason to say that the results of the conference triggered further positive changes in international affairs and broadened the possibility to strengthen security on the European continent and follow the way of equal and mutually profitable cooperation. In our days the development of political circumstances here is linked, to an ever greater extent, with the implementation of the Helsinki agreements. A great deal has already been accomplished in this area. Some progress has been made in the development of political, economic, cultural, and other relations among European countries. Peace in Europe has become more stable, and Europe has reached a higher level in resolving the problem of guaranteeing its own security.

The end of the stage of European post-war development and the promotion of the task of the establishment of new international relations on the European continent are legitimate consequences of the increased role of the socialist

countries and of the impact of their coordinated policy in the struggle for peace and international cooperation. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev recalled this again in Prague, on 31 May: "This is the fourth decade of peace in Europe. This is very important. Never before has history been able to grant the peoples on our continent such a lasting peace. The peoples must be made clearly aware of the fact that this is largely, and even decisively, the result of the fact that today half of Europe is living under socialist conditions. Peace in Europe is largely the result of our joint efforts and of the coordinated foreign policy of the Warsaw Pact members."

The Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries are in the vanguard of the struggle for the implementation of the Helsinki agreements as an inviolable entity. The pivotal idea of the Final Act, organically combining its entire content--is the idea of expanding and deepening the detente process and of giving it an aggressive and firm nature. It is fully consistent with the efforts of the USSR to ensure further improvement of international circumstances. The decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and of the the congresses of the fraternal parties of European socialist countries were the greatest possible contribution to the strengthening of detente. Actively following a line of total implementation of the Final Act and the development of peaceful cooperation in Europe is one of the main tasks formulated in the program for the further struggle for peace and international cooperation, freedom, and independence of the peoples, formulated at the CPSU Congress.

Having formulated the objectives of the foreign policy of its country, in the course of the drafting of the new USSR Constitution the Soviet people codified in the fundamental law of the country the principles governing relations among countries. They were reflected in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference. These principles became a Soviet constitutional norm.

The conference of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact members, held in Bucharest in November 1976, was a major landmark in the course of the implementation of the Helsinki agreements. Its participants adopted an expanded program for the struggle for the intensification of detente, firm implementation of the principles of the Final Act, disarmament, and reduction of the military confrontation in Europe.

The struggle for lasting peace is a matter not only of governments but of peoples, of broad workers' masses, and of their political vanguard. This was most clearly emphasized at the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe, held in Berlin in June 1976. The participants called for strict observance and full implementation of principles and agreements of the Final Act. They called for putting an end to the arms race and the initiation of the process of a reduction of armaments and armed forces. They expressed their conviction that Europe could and should become an example of the practical implementation of measures for detente in the military area. The European Communists' Forum earmarked the ways along which the working class and the popular masses would be able to make successful use of today's favorable possibilities for the practical solution of the problem of converting Europe into a continent of lasting peace and cooperation and for the achievement of social progress.

The mass public movement in favor of strengthening the peace has a great role and responsibility. The past few years have been noted by events in the development of this movement such as the January 1977 Moscow World Peace Congress, the May 1977 Warsaw World Meeting of Builders of a Durable Peace, the new initiative of the Brussels International Committee for European Security and Cooperation, and others.

The positive influence of the results of the European Conference is expressed in the fact that bilateral relations between participating countries are assuming a more stable and comprehensive nature. The significance of the Final Act and the importance of the implementation of its principles and stipulations are emphasized in many documents reflecting the results of the talks between Soviet leaders and the heads of states and governments and governmental leaders in France, the FRG, Britain, Italy, Turkey, Finland, Portugal, Sweden, Denmark, and other European countries.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's visit to France in June 1977 was an outstanding international event. The result of his talks with President V. Giscard d'Estaing a "Joint Declaration between the Soviet Union and France on Detente" was concluded. This was the first bilateral document especially and fully dedicated to this matter. It contained an answer to the requirements of the time concerning the international policies of two big powers belonging to different socioeconomic systems. The basis of the document is the coincidence of views on the fact that at a time when armaments have reached a tremendous destructive power and when a considerable part of the earth's population is urgently faced with the problem of satisfying vital material needs, the supreme interests of mankind most adamantly demand of countries and peoples to abandon policies based on mistrust, rivalry, and tension. The Soviet Union and France included in the list of the main directions of efforts in favor of detente the specific implementation of the Helsinki Final Act. Taking into consideration that detente is developing in complex circumstances and that there still exist influential forces in the world which mount sallies against it and are trying to undermine it, the political will of the USSR and France to act in such a way as to make detente stronger and universal acquired a particularly important and essential significance.

Such Soviet-French accords play the role of a substantial stimulating factor in international life. As we know, at the 22nd United Nations General Assembly the Soviet Union posed the question of the intensification and strengthening of detente and preventing the danger of a nuclear war. The draft document submitted to it within the framework of this question is largely based on the content of the "Joint Declaration of the Soviet Union and France on Detente." The "Declaration on the Intensification and Strengthening of Detente," adopted by the session on its basis, was a major contribution to the implementation of the United Nations' main task--ensuring international peace and security.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's recent visit to the FRG proved with particular clarity that the normalizing of the political climate in Europe is one of the most important peaceful achievements of the last decade. In fact, it would

be hardly possible to find another European country the organization of relations with which would involve the surmounting of so many objective and subjective obstacles, and such complex steps. "Yet, today," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said, "relations between the USSR and the FRG--without ignoring negative aspects--have become one of the important elements of European stability and detente on the European continent." A tremendous amount of fruitful work was accomplished in the course of the visit aimed at comprehensively contributing to the specific and effective efforts to be undertaken, unilaterally, bilaterally, and multilaterally, to intensify the process of detente fully in accordance with the Final Act. The task was also formulated of making use of all possibilities and means for the termination of the arms race--nuclear and conventional--limiting armaments and implementing specific measures in the field of disarmament. The joint declaration signed in Bonn on 6 May was consistent with this objective.

The visits which Turkish Prime Minister B. Ecevit paid to the Soviet Union became a real contribution to the development of peaceful cooperation among participants in the European Conference.

Together with the USSR, the other socialist countries are making a substantial contribution to the development of relations among the participants in the European Conference. Since August 1975 Poland has included several tens of agreements and declarations related to the implementation of the Helsinki decisions. The GDR initiated talks with many capitalist countries and concluded with them agreements and treaties in the spirit of the stipulations of the Final Act dealing with bilateral relations. In accordance with this act considerable progress was made in the development of relations between Czechoslovakia and France, Austria, and other Western European countries. Bulgaria and Hungary are making considerable contributions to the implementation of the Helsinki agreements. Romania launched a number of initiatives. Yugoslavia is working for the implementation of the Final Act.

II.

The Final Act is imbued with concern for peace in Europe and for strengthening the security of European nations. All the participants in the European Conference must, in accordance with their obligations stipulated in the Final Act, make efforts aimed at reducing the military confrontation on the continent and take practical steps in the field of disarmament. This would make it possible to add military to political detente. This is the precise direction followed by suggestions formulated after the European Conference by the Warsaw Pact members in the 1976 Bucharest Declaration of the Political Consultative Committee.

The implementation of the measures contained in the Final Act aimed at strengthening trust and ensuring advance information on major military exercises, and invitations extended to many foreign observers to attend them, stipulated in the Final Act, also contribute to the creation of a more tranquil atmosphere in Europe.

Detente is not a self-developing process. It requires the efforts of all interested parties. "Further detente in Europe," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted, "largely depends on the solution of ripe and urgent problems of military detente. One could also say that we have reached a point at which the process of political detente must merge with that of military detente. That is why the most important thing today is the adoption of practical measures to reduce the arms race and restrain it."

The Vienna talks on reciprocal reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe are one of the most important directions in this area. Here, i.e., the area currently covered by the talks, for quite some time the Soviet Union has not broadened or increased its armed forces. The USSR and its allies have repeatedly called for an agreement on the part of all sides to assume the direct obligation of not increasing their armed forces and armaments in Central Europe for the duration of the Vienna talks. However, so far the Western countries have not accepted this proposal and their own practical actions are following the opposite direction.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have invariably held, and are holding, a constructive position at the Vienna talks. They are sincerely trying to accelerate the process of reaching an agreement. Recently this aspiration was supported by yet another important proof: On 8 June the delegations of the USSR, GDR, Poland, and Czechoslovakia submitted in Vienna new important proposals aimed at giving the talks a fruitful nature.

The essence of the new proposals submitted by the socialist countries is that they list specific parameters for the withdrawal of Soviet and American forces during the initial stage. The figures are substantial. For its part, the USSR is ready to withdraw within one year three divisions with the corresponding military hardware, including approximately 1,000 tanks.

Furthermore, the reduction of NATO and Warsaw Pact armed forces would take place in such a way as to preserve their balance. As a result of the withdrawal of the forces by all countries, the suggestion calls for establishing a common ceiling for each of the groups in Central Europe.

The new proposals submitted by the socialist countries create a factual foundation for the elaboration of a mutually acceptable agreement on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe without threatening the security of the participating countries.

"The socialist countries," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in Minsk, on 25 June, "offer their partners a sensible and realistic compromise. Submitting the proposal, they have gone more than half-way. We address ourselves to the NATO countries: Let us, finally, turn to action. Unquestionably, a basis for agreement already exists. Now everything depends on the political will of the West. The reaching of an agreement in Vienna would enable us to undertake in the future the discussion of other specific problems of military detente in Europe of interest to the parties."

Following the European Conference in obvious contradiction to the spirit and letter of the Final Act, a new threat to European detente was created. It is a question of the Pentagon's plan calling for the manufacturing and deployment of the neutron weapon in Western Europe by the United States. It is entirely obvious that the implementation of this plan by U.S. militaristic circles would inevitably lower the threshold of the use of nuclear weapons and, consequently, make the unleashing of a nuclear war more likely and involve the adoption of the neutron weapon by the other group of countries. This would open a new direction in the nuclear arms race, similar to the atomic in the 1940's and the thermo-nuclear in the 1950's.

Desirous to block such a development of events, the Soviet Union suggested to the United States an agreement on the reciprocal abandonment of the making of the nuclear bomb. Together with the other socialist countries it presented for discussion by the committee on disarmament a draft international convention on banning the manufacturing, stockpiling, deployment, and utilization of the nuclear neutron weapon.

Faced with the firm counteraction on the part of the USSR and the other socialist countries, and the pressure of the broad democratic circles in the Western countries themselves, the implementation of neutron plans seems to be temporarily postponed. However, its threat remains. It remains a source of the deepest concern to all who care for the fate of the world. The urgent task on the agenda of international life, in this connection, is to ban the manufacturing of the neutron bomb and the non-admission of its deployment in Western Europe.

Also remaining on the agenda is the platform for action, formulated by the Soviet Union in October 1977, aimed at the consolidation of military detente in Europe. It calls for the conclusion of a treaty among the participants in the European Conference on not being the first to use nuclear weapons against one another; an agreement on at least not adding new members to the military-political groups and alliances confronting each other on the European continent; an agreement not to conduct military exercises involving the participation of over 50,000-60,000 men; the extension to military measures of trust, stipulated in the Final Act, to countries in the Southern Mediterranean.

The Soviet Union believes that all such problems could be thoroughly discussed in the immediate future--along with the continuing Vienna talks--in the course of special consultations by all participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Without denying in the least while, conversely, acknowledging the positive value of the measures already practiced for strengthening the trust, the USSR proceeds from the fact that specific steps aimed at limiting and reducing armed forces and armaments, including nuclear weapons, and reducing the military confrontation in Europe, are of the greatest value in the establishment and further development of real trust.

Another example of the policy in the spirit of the Helsinki agreements is the Soviet proposal of concluding a universal treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. The conclusion of such a treaty, in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the Final Act of the European Conference, would contribute to the implementation of the principle of abandoning the use of force or the threat of its application as an effective law of international life. This would strengthen trust among all countries and nations and create more favorable grounds for the solution of disarmament problems.

Addressing the 18th Komsomol Congress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev formulated in his speech a broad system of specific measures aimed at reducing the quantitative and qualitative growth of armaments, including nuclear weapons, by countries with a great military potential. This program became the basis of Comrade A. A. Gromyko's address to the special United Nations General Assembly on disarmament and of the Soviet proposals he submitted "On Practical Ways for Terminating the Arms Race."

At the session the USSR and the other socialist countries presented a broad, daring and, at the same time, realistic program for total termination of the arms race. Their proposals were the focal point of discussions by the Assembly which confirmed, yet once again, the most profound interest of all mankind in the solution of this problem.

The Soviet disarmament initiatives were welcomed approvingly throughout the world. However, forces exist which oppose them in all possible ways and which intensify the atmosphere of fear and hostility in relations among peoples and states and question the possibility of a practical limitation of arms and disarmament.

Was this not confirmed by the results of the May NATO council meeting in Washington at which the decision was made to spend an additional \$80 billion on a long-term program for the manufacturing of weapons of all types? This decision clearly contradicts the spirit and letter of the Final Act and is a challenge to world public opinion, aimed at increasing international tension. In the light of this step, prepared at length by NATO staffs, the true meaning of the anti-socialist campaign mounted in the West against the "military threat" from the East and human rights "violations" is exposed. Today it has become even clearer that this entire propaganda noise conceals the NATO decision to initiate a new round in the arms race and impose on the peoples a new burden of military expenditures. Lip service paid to detente in the course of the NATO council session could not conceal the fact that the session itself was more like a conference of chiefs of staffs formulating plans for an extensive and lengthy military campaign. Unquestionably, the line of expanding preparations for a new war will meet with the firm opposition on the part of anyone caring for the peace and security of the nations.

At the same time, there are various circles in Europe and outside it who, regardless of their political views, can realistically assess world circumstances, clearly realizing that the continuing arms race is the main threat

to the cause of peace. Thus, a meeting of leaders of socialist parties of Common Market countries, and Greece, Spain, and Portugal was held in June, in Brussels. The declaration passed at the meeting emphasizes that "the arms race must be stopped as it absorbs huge resources and threatens to disturb the balance of forces through the development of new types of weapons and the proliferation of nuclear arms."

The initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in the field of disarmament are the practical implementation of the Helsinki agreements on the need to add to political detente efforts to help disarmament. The purpose of these initiatives is to put a complete end to the further quantitative and qualitative growth of armaments and of the armed forces of countries with major military potential, restricting the material foundations of the danger of the outbreak of war, and conversion to the radical solution of the problem of universal and total disarmament. Their implementation would offer material guarantees for universal and European security and for the development of international relations based on the principles of peaceful coexistence.

III.

The very title of the European Conference reflects the close interconnection between security and cooperation. Indeed, progress on the path of political and military detent offers new possibilities for equal and mutually profitable cooperation among countries. In turn, this strengthens and intensifies detente, giving it a material substance.

Guided by such considerations, the Soviet Union has called for the development of European cooperation in the fields of environment, and the development of transportation and power industry. The scale and complexity of these problems demand far-reaching and important decisions which can be made at a sufficiently high intergovernmental level. This task could be accomplished at European intergovernmental conferences as proposed by the Soviet Union. The practical problems related to the possible holding of such an European forum on the environment were considered by the United Nations European Economic Commission which also showed an interest in the possibility to convene conferences on two other topics--transportation and power industry.

Work is being done to implement the Helsinki agreements on the development of economic cooperation on a bilateral basis.

After the European Conference, for example, a 10 year program for economic and industrial cooperation was concluded between the USSR and Italy; Soviet-French accords were reached on cooperation in power industry, civil aviation and the aerospace industry. A 10 year agreement was concluded with Canada for economic, industrial, and scientific and technical cooperation. Agreements were concluded on the same subjects with Cyprus and Portugal. Recently, last May, an agreement was concluded on the development and intensification of long-term cooperation between the USSR and the FRG in economics and industry. This will provide great stability to and broaden relations between them.

The talks between CEMA and Common Market members on the conclusion of an agreement for foundations of reciprocal relations are consistent with the spirit of the Final Act.

All this contributes to the gradual conversion of economic relations between East and West to a solid long-term base. Naturally, results could have been even more tangible had all participating countries equally supported the agreement reached in Helsinki on the elimination of obstacles on the way to the development of mutually profitable trade.

Some capitalist countries have reserved their former discriminatory restrictions in trading with socialist countries, as inherited from cold-war times. Frequent attempts are being made, as has been the case of late with the American administration, to use economic relations as an instrument of political pressure exerted by certain countries on others. The further development of mutually profitable economic relations calls for the practical implementation of the acknowledgment codified in the Final Act by all signatory states of the beneficial influence of the most favored nation system on the development of commerce. The retention of list of goods banned for export to the socialist countries, containing so-called strategic goods, and the practice of erecting organizational barriers restricting the size of members of trade missions of socialist countries, along with other discriminatory measures, are inconsistent with the spirit of the Helsinki agreements.

Useful results have been achieved in the development of cooperation in the humanitarian and other areas with a view to strengthening the peace, mutual understanding among nations, and the spiritual enrichment of the individual. The Soviet state has always paid attention to cultural and art exchanges with foreign countries, to ensuring the access of Soviet citizens to the true treasures of the cultures of other countries and world civilization, and the familiarization of other nations with Soviet art and with our historical and cultural monuments.

The Helsinki agreements on the development of contacts offers broad scope for a wide variety of relations and encounters among institutions, organizations, individuals, representatives of trade unions, and women's, youth, religious, and other associations. "We are open to anything that is truthful and honest and are ready comprehensively to increase contacts, using the favorable conditions of detente," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said.

Therefore, the facts prove that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are actively pursuing a line of total implementation of the Final Act of the European Conference. The steps they have taken for the implementation of the Helsinki agreements, as in their time the joint and coordinated steps of the Warsaw Pact members, provide the example to other countries.

In the course of that period the important circumstance became obvious that the pace at which the Final Act is implemented largely depends on the overall level of detente and the condition and development of bilateral relations

between participating countries. Those who counteract detente--as we know, such circles exist in Western countries--thus hinder the very efforts aimed at the implementation of one or another accepted stipulation.

Yet, the solidity of the Final Act and its high vital strength were redemonstrated at the Belgrade meeting of representatives of participating countries. The meeting took place under complex circumstances. Whereas from the very beginning the Soviet delegation tried to hold it in a constructive spirit, as an act of cooperation, the representatives of other countries, the United States above all, tried to give it a polemic nature. In the final account, a communique was adopted asserting the significance of the Final Act and its agreements representing a long-term program for governmental action aimed at ensuring security and cooperation in Europe.

The resolve to continue the multilateral process initiated at the European Conference was confirmed at the meeting. The next such meeting will be held in Madrid, in November 1980. Agreement was also reached to hold conferences by experts of participating members on the development of a universally acceptable method for the peaceful settlement of disputes, and the development of economic, scientific and cultural cooperation in the Mediterranean. Recently, a decision was passed at the conference of experts of member countries, held in Bonn, to hold a "Scientific Forum" in Hamburg in 1980.

The experience acquired in the past three years on the implementation of the Final Act indicates that, as a whole, the participating countries have developed a reciprocal understanding of the fact that its implementation must be approached not as a single entity, while preventing distortions or arbitrary interpretations of the document. Yet, a slanderous campaign against the socialist comity is being steadily pursued in a number of countries, the United States above all.

History is familiar with many cases of sallies, forgeries, various types of aggressive concepts, and all kinds of ideological subversions directed against our country. The purpose of such actions is to prevent the establishment of the principles of peaceful coexistence in international relations, and to reject the ideas of peace and international and European security formulated by socialism. They have been, and will be, swept off the high road of history, while the ideas of peace and international cooperation will continue to be asserted further, enriching their meaning, and gaining ever greater acknowledgment.

The Soviet Union has no reasons to avoid any serious discussion of the topic of human rights. It has not only codified in its constitution these rights, in their broadest possible extent, but has guaranteed their factual implementation. At the same time, it has actively supported the reflection of basic principles and concepts in the field of guarantees of human rights in the United Nations Charter. All essential international documents on such matters were adopted with its active participation, such as the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide and

on Its Punishment; Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Apartheid and on Punishing It; Convention on the Political Rights of Women; Convention on the Non-Acceptability of a Statute of Limitations in Cases of Military Crimes and Crimes against Mankind, and others. The very fact that international pacts on human rights have been ratified by the United Nations is to the great credit to the members of the socialist comity. Our country was one of the first to ratify them. Let us recall, yet once again, that a number of Western countries, the United States in particular, are continuing to delay the adoption of obligations based on international conventions and other agreements in this field.

The first right of man is the right to life, to a lasting peace. From the international viewpoint the preservation and guarantee of peace is a condition for saving man from the danger of his destruction in the flames of war. At the same time, the consolidation of the peace creates favorable external conditions for ensuring the social progress of all countries and nations. "The greatest manifestation of democracy," Lenin taught, "is found in the basic problem of war and peace" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 40, p 92). Therefore, those who urge on the arms race are trying to aggravate international circumstances, poison relations between countries and nations, and make attempts on the most important right of man and a nation--the right to peace. This has been widely acknowledged in numerous international documents. The Final Act clearly states that the member countries must "abstain from the propaganda of aggressive wars or any application of force or threat of force," or "providing direct or indirect assistance to terrorist activities or to subversive or other activities." This means that organizations and individuals whose activities are aimed at increasing international tension and promoting mistrust and hostility among states must face the negative attitude of the members of the European Conference.

It is entirely obvious that international cooperation in the field of human rights must be consistent with the United Nations Charter, i.e., while strictly observing the universally recognized principles governing relations among countries, including respect for sovereign equality and non-interference. This is most clearly stipulated in the Final Act.

The assertion of the principles of social equality and justice became the most important gain of the October Revolution. No single society which has ever existed on earth has done or could do so much for the people's masses and the working people as socialism. The Soviet state not only proclaims but factually guarantees the rights of the Soviet people, of every Soviet person, the way capitalism has neither succeeded nor been able to accomplish in any country in the world. This is convincingly asserted in the USSR Constitution. It proved again that the concepts of freedom, human rights, democracy, and social justice acquire a true meaning only under the conditions of a socialist system.

Yet, something else as well is obvious. Those who, in the West, promote a stir on the subject of imaginary "violations" of human rights under socialism are not interested in the fate of hundreds or millions of their own citizens who suffer from exploitation, unemployment, social injustice, racial discrimination, persecutions, violations of their interests because of political convictions, gangsterism, and other crimes. Ignoring all this, they claim some kind of a "right" to dictate to other countries the type of laws and customs they should have. In other words, they are trying to legalize interference in the domestic affairs of the socialist countries using, among other methods, distorted interpretations of international agreements.

In fact, such actions mean the introduction in international relations of the ways and means of psychological warfare. This subverts the process of organization of cooperation, initiated in Helsinki, and represents a step backwards to the resumption of confrontation. The actions of the American radio stations Liberty and Free Europe, which are continuing to intensify the cold war hysteria, are a gross violation of the Final Act. Their activities conflict with the Helsinki principles, the basic norms of international law, detente, and good neighborly peaceful coexistence.

The Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries are firmly rebuffing the amateurs of interfering in internal affairs, firmly proclaiming their opposition to any revision or distortion of the Final Act and its stipulations or of the directions of the detente process defined in Helsinki. The elimination of psychological warfare is a structural component of the general task of strengthening the peace and normalizing international circumstances.

The Soviet state was the first to formulate the idea of the indivisibility of peace. This idea imbues Lenin's decree on peace and all subsequent Soviet initiatives aimed at ensuring international security. This idea, embodied in the Final Act of the European Conference, is systematically being defended by the USSR to this day. It consistently favors the indivisibility of detente and making it all-embracing. To proclaim, as some do in the West, for demagogic purposes, that detente must become all-embracing is like trying to break through an open door. Yes, detente must indeed become all-embracing. This viewpoint has always been supported by the Soviet Union.

Today's Europe has covered a long way in strengthening reciprocal trust and promoting detente. However, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has frequently emphasized, this common gain of the peace-loving countries on the continent must be constantly supported and broadened. This is particularly important today when, once again, a trend toward aggravation is being detected in international circumstances. It is precisely Europe which could prove in practice how to coexist, cooperate, and work together.

CONTEMPORARY CAPITALISM AND THE PROBLEM OF ALLIES OF THE PROLETARIAT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 100-107

[Article by G. Rudenko, doctor of economic sciences; published as a basis for discussion]

[Text] The problem of the allies of the proletariat is of essential importance in Lenin's theory of the revolution. Lenin invariably paid the closest possible attention to the theoretical and practical-political aspects of this problem and the elaboration of strategy and tactics for involving the hesitating population strata on the side of the proletariat, brilliantly confirmed in the course of the October Revolution.

Today--the epoch of transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism on a universal scale--the fate of a revolution depends to a tremendous extent on the ability of the two confronting classes to draw over on its side mass allies and satellites from the intermediary population strata in the capitalist countries. Historical experience has proved that intermediary strata which join the ruling bourgeoisie in the heat of class battles could become the mass base of reactionary movements and even to contribute to the victory of fascism as was the case in Italy and Germany, and, recently, Chile.

Essential quantitative and qualitative changes occur as the pace of social development accelerates in the intermediary strata of the developed bourgeois society, changes which can not fail to influence their ability to become the allies or fellow travelers of the revolutionary proletariat. Yet, this problem has been obviously ignored in contemporary publications while the concept of "fellow travelers" has been almost totally abandoned.

Leninism teaches us that in the elaboration of any social problem whatever its formulation within specific historical frameworks is an absolute requirement.

In order to meet this requirement and not err in the assessment of contemporary intermediary strata and in the policy to be pursued toward them today, obviously, the following precise knowledge must be acquired: 1. The

manner in which they change quantitatively; 2. The qualitative changes which occur in the social structure, organization, ideology, and politics of such strata in the course of their existence under capitalist conditions; 3. The true attitude of monopoly capital to small enterprise and to the middle classes themselves as the social product of such enterprise; 4. The personal attitude of the small entrepreneurs toward the monopolies and their social product--the ruling monopoly oligarchy.

The present article does not lay a claim to a comprehensive assessment of the contemporary role of intermediary strata but shall discuss only the main countries of monopoly capitalism, even though the processes occurring in them indicate, to a certain extent, the possible course of development of a number of new applicants for membership in the club of imperialist countries (Brazil, Argentina, Spain, Greece, and others). Naturally, such problems arise in a different way in the young liberated countries where the process of establishment of the basic social classes is far from complete. Naturally, the study of the problem of the allies of the working class calls for a consideration of its inherent qualitative specifics if the problem is considered on a universal scale, as one of the key problems of the class struggle in the international arena.

The starting question in the problem of allies and fellow travelers is the assessment of the fate of the petite bourgeoisie under imperialist conditions, of this most numerous part of the intermediary strata.

There is an opinion, even based on certain facts, that the strength of the petite bourgeoisie must steadily decline since the monopolies are destroying petty enterprise. Such a one-sided interpretation of the trend leads to the corresponding conclusion that, sooner or later, petty enterprise will basically disappear while the political result of this viewpoint is a weakening of attention toward such allegedly obsolete strata and their possibility to become a major ally of or hindrance to the proletariat.

In our view, such a formulation of the problem absolutizes merely one of the aspects of monopoly capitalism. The monopolies indeed eliminate hundreds of thousands of petty entrepreneurs. This category includes, primarily, the petite bourgeoisie which was inherited by capitalism from feudal times as an alien stratum destroyed with the development of the capitalist system (traditional peasantry, artisans, and others). At some individual historical stages in the history of imperialism such elimination or reduction of the stratum of petty owners could even become dominant and determine the overall trend of capitalist evolution. This, we repeat, however, is merely one aspect of the process. The other is that state-monopoly capitalism reproduces constantly and hourly new small owners and creates new areas of application of small capital. Such social groups are created by the very capitalist system (above all the development of services) and, unlike the case of the petite bourgeoisie, inherited from feudal times, are structural elements of highly developed capitalism.

For example, in the course of its establishment, the monopolized automobile industry totally ruined and destroyed tens of thousands of small enterprises which produced the old means of transportation such as coaches, horse-drawn omnibuses, buggies, carts of various kinds, and so on. At the same time, however, the automobile monopolies created tens and hundreds of thousands of small and very small enterprises: Suppliers of individual parts, repair garages, gasoline stations, and others. Many thousands of coffee shops, cafeterias, barber shops, and other small enterprises appeared to service the workers and employees of these monopolies.

In the daily history of highly developed capitalist countries, the fast growth of small enterprises was typical as a whole.

In the United States, for example, the number of individually owned enterprises (i.e., excluding shareholder and partnership enterprises), rose between 1945 and 1968 from 5,689,000 to 9,212,000. The overwhelming majority of them--over 96 percent--are small businesses (with gross sales not exceeding \$100,000 per year).

In 1968 the United States had a population of 200 million while the adult population (over 21) accounted for 120 million. Therefore, even in such a highly monopolized country, there was one small business per 22 people or per 13 adults.

Japan holds second place in the capitalist world in the volume of output. The all-embracing domination of the country by big monopolies is obvious. Nevertheless, from 1957 to 1969 the number of single-owner enterprises here rose in all sectors (excluding agriculture) from 2,754,000 to 3,460,000. Even more importantly, the overall number of their employees rose from 7,410,000 to 10,221,000. Thus, the average personnel per such enterprise do not exceed three people (including the owner). In 1969 Japan had a population in excess of 100 million. There was one small business per 28 people. Adding to this small enterprises with no hired labor and small enterprises in agriculture, there would be one such enterprise per no more than 10 adults.

France has about 1.8 million industrial and commercial enterprises, 1.4 million of which are very small in which there is either no hired labor or with very insignificant hired labor (no more than 5 people). These are the enterprises of the petite bourgeoisie. Similar examples could be found in practically all other highly developed capitalist countries. This most clearly proves that the biggest capitalist countries, in which the rule of monopoly capital has been long and firmly established, and in which today the process of further concentration of power in the hands of few magnates is actively developing, are also areas of fast numerical growth of small and very small businesses.

This means that inherent in capitalism is not only a trend toward reducing petty ownership but of increasing the number of small entrepreneurs. Either trend may be dominant in different historical stages or in a single stage but in different economic sectors.

The Marxist-Leninist classics clearly saw this dialectics of development. "In countries where modern civilization has developed," wrote the founders of scientific communism in the "Communist Party Manifesto," "a new petite bourgeoisie has been formed, and is constantly being renewed as an additional part of the bourgeois society, vascillating between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 4, p 450).

In addition to the other two basic classes in bourgeois society, the establishment by capitalism of a new petite bourgeoisie as its additional part was further developed in the imperialist stage as well. "Pure imperialism," V. I. Lenin claimed, "has never existed, exists nowhere and will never exist without a fundamental capitalist base" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 38, p 151). Lenin pointed out that " . . . Our task would have been made the one hundred thousand times easier had we been faced with an integral time of imperialism which would have totally redone capitalism. This would have given us the type of system in which everything would obey a single financial capitalism. At that point all that would remain would be to overthrow the upper crust and leave the rest in the hands of the proletariat. This would have been exceptionally pleasant but this is not the reality. In reality, the development is such as to require entirely different actions" (ibid, pp 154-155).

Naturally, in this case V. I. Lenin had in mind the millions of petty owners who had to be rallied and organized in the struggle against monopoly capital for the establishment of a people's regime and after the victory undertake the building of a socialist society. This task is far from easy; monopoly capital tries, frequently successfully, to draw such owners over on its side to fight the proletariat.

Therefore, two dangers exist of improperly interpreting the problem of the changed strength of petty enterprise and the petite bourgeoisie in highly developed capitalist countries. The first is to absolutize their reduction trend; the consequence of such a theory is a return to the concept of "pure imperialism," and, in practical terms, a weakening of the specific attention paid to the problem of allies in the revolution.

The opposite danger is to absolutize the trend of the growth of the petite bourgeoisie; its theoretical consequence becomes the underestimating of contradictions between the petite bourgeoisie and big capital. In practice this may mean a lessening of attention to the elaboration of a constructive social alternative for the middle classes.

The contemporary growth of small business means, on the one hand, a considerable broadening of the potential mass of allies and fellow travelers of the proletariat and, on the other, the increased complexity of the ways for converting this mass into an active or reserve army of the revolution.

The occurring quantitative changes in the middle strata are accompanied by important qualitative changes in their social structure, status, class awareness, and others. At the beginning of the imperialist epoch the social structure of the middle classes was simple and relatively stable. The

peasant mass was their main and decisive segment. The strategy and tactic of attracting allies and fellow travelers were then primarily based on the peasantry and its essential strata. The urban and rural craftsmen and artisans--the second largest share of the intermediary strata of the times--had also essentially remained from the feudal epoch and developed, partially, as a product of capitalism as well. This was discussed by Lenin in his work "The Development of Capitalism in Russia." In addition to these two major categories of intermediate strata there was an extremely thin stratum of the intelligentsia represented essentially by people in the liberal professions.

The bulk of the middle classes of the time--peasants, artisans, and craftsmen--was characterized by the following features: 1. Concentration of their overwhelming majority in the production area; 2. Manual labor and primitive equipment; 3. Manufacturing of an insignificant volume of consumer goods; 4. Social, political, and spiritual backwardness, and alienation; 5. Acute social antagonism for capitalists and landowners who were suppressing them both as exploited and competitors.

The extent of the quality changes in the intermediary strata of the developed bourgeois society is apparent from the fact that these characteristics are no longer essentially typical of the contemporary middle strata.

Today only a small percentage of petty enterprises are directly engaged in production. With few exceptions, small-scale production in town and country is based not on manual but on machine, even though not always modern, tools. New labor means have transformed the petty producers, and changed their cultural standard and nature of relations with society. Today the middle classes are concentrated mainly in the big cities and involved in political life. They have their own ideologues and mass organizations, and can have a great deal of influence on the course of social life as a whole. As science converts into productive force profound changes occur in the numerical strength and role of the intelligentsia in public life.

Therefore, whereas at the beginning of the century the word "ally" was primarily associated with the illiterate and neglected peasant, today the concept frequently and correctly applies to the resident of a modern city, mostly with secondary and, frequently, higher education.

Yet, this is not the main fact. Unlike the traditional strata, the contemporary middle classes are shaped under the conditions of the imperialist system and represent its capillaries. Whereas the main classes in bourgeois society have long covered the way from birth to maturity, a similar (even though not identical) way is covered by the middle classes as a capitalist element only in the imperialist epoch.

The social product of the economic relation between "monopoly-small business" is the relation "financial oligarchy-contemporary petite bourgeoisie." In this case each side protects and defends its own interests. Hence the double content of the positions held by each side and the need for their differentiated analysis.

We know that even at its final stage capitalism can not exist without the mass of small and very small enterprises, without the mass of the petite bourgeoisie and the small capitalists. The very mechanism of capitalist production would be inconceivable without them. However, another, frequently ignored, aspect exists. It is that not only the objective laws governing the development of capitalist society but the conscious and purposeful policy of the monopoly bourgeoisie and its state influence the formation and activities of the petite bourgeoisie. This subjective factor becomes particularly important in the conditions of the struggle between the two conflicting systems. Monopoly capital and the financial oligarchy are interested in the existence and numerical growth of small business and the petite bourgeoisie for social, economic, political, and ideological reasons.

The financial oligarchy which rules the highly developed capitalist countries represents an insignificant and an ever declining percentage of the population. In the United States 3,000 to 5,000 families, or no more than 20,000 people, may belong to it out of a population of 217,700,000. In order to keep themselves in power, the capitalist magnates need a mass social base. It is precisely this role that the petite bourgeoisie which, according to approximate estimates, numbers some 20 to 30 million people in the United States (along with the members of their families) has been called upon to play.

The economic interests of big capitalism as well require the existence of small business. The wages of its workers are lower; social outlays are lesser, the working people are organized less well, and the production and technical base is far simpler and less expensive than at big enterprises. Encompassing within their activities the small businessmen, the monopolies save working and fixed capital, thus acquiring the possibility not only to use but advertise the advantages of their own enterprises. In addition to purely economic advantages, letting small businessmen produce individual parts has important social consequences, for it relieves the monopolies from the excessive concentration of the proletariat at their enterprises, weakening their organization. Furthermore, the middle classes are part of the reserve hired labor army which advantageously affects both the market and the cost of manpower.

The petite bourgeoisie is rendering a considerable service to big capital ideologically. Penetrating the working class and its organizations, the views of the petite bourgeoisie undermine the unity within proletarian ranks and the strength of the proletariat, promoting illusions of an allegedly existing possibility to live decently under capitalism as well.

One of the most essential facts is that under crisis conditions and circumstances marked by acute and major social conflicts, the petite bourgeoisie could become and, as history has indicated, frequently becomes the political ally of big capital and its shock force.

Bearing all this in mind, in the epoch of decisive class battles the monopoly bourgeoisie pursues a policy of preservation and multiplication of small business wherever this does not directly conflict with its interests. This policy is of strategic rather than tactical nature. Its final objective is the fullest possible integration of the petite bourgeoisie within the system of oligarchy rule.

Naturally, this does not mean in the least that such a situation would weaken in any way the oppressive nature of the exploitation to which financial capitalism continues to subject the petite bourgeoisie. From this viewpoint its true interests remain hostile to the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie and its only promising policy is a policy of participation in anti-monopoly alliances. The concept and interests of monopoly capitalism concerning the petite bourgeoisie are a different matter. The previously accurate concept that such interests are radically hostile to the small businessman and that the policy of getting along with him is merely tactical deserves today most serious consideration.

The following question arises: If monopoly capitalism is interested in the existence of middle classes, how do such middle classes themselves relate to monopoly capitalism? A general answer to this question which would apply to all middle classes and strata would be hardly possible.

Naturally, like all intermediary strata in capitalist society in general, the petite bourgeoisie is exploited by the monopolies and is quite clearly aware of such exploitation. For example, small businessmen supplying parts to the monopolies have converted, essentially, into a "partial worker" producing an item which could not be marketed outside a given monopoly. The owners of such enterprises frequently try to weaken such comprehensive dependence. Sharp contradictions arise between small businessmen and monopolies on matters of prices, financing, and others.

However, by virtue of a number of other important circumstances, the small producers remain tied, as the saying goes, hand and feet. Included among such circumstances are the following:

1. Under the conditions of machine technology, when the small enterprise, as a rule, no longer produces individual finished items, as it did at the turn of the century, but merely individual parts, no single small producer can develop his own marketing network for the sale of his goods. Latest technology has firmly tied the petty owners to the big monopolies and general stores, making this tie a condition for the very existence of small business in industry.
2. The monopolies have immeasurably greater possibilities to withstand market fluctuations and cyclical and other crises and to ensure a relative stability of orders without which a small company would be doomed.

3. The monopolies help the small businessman acquire more modern equipment and apply new technologies. This increases the competitiveness of the related small enterprise.

4. Working for a monopoly develops within the small businessman, in his own environment, a perhaps seeming affiliation with big business and, frequently, the prestige aspect results in great facilities in obtaining loans, assuming elective positions in various organizations, and so on.

5. In the United States and the FRG a substantial percentage of small businessmen keep their savings for a "rainy day" or retirement in monopoly stock. Thus, in the United States there are over 31 million individuals owning such stock. Even assuming that the bourgeois class numbers several million people, the remaining bulk of stockholders largely belongs to the middle classes. The fear of losing its savings also ties the petite bourgeoisie to the system of monopoly capitalism.

In addition to these and other reasons--specific to the various petty producer strata--all small businessmen are linked with the monopolies by their desire to rely on powerful capital, particularly in periods of growing social instability.

All this gives us reason to say that the current attitude of monopoly capital toward the petite bourgeoisie and the latter's attitude toward the monopolies contain, along with deep contradictions, major elements of reciprocal interest, even though in the various groups of intermediary strata the nature of relations with the monopolies are distinguished not only by common but also substantially specific features. Lenin wrote that "the petite bourgeoisie is two-faced by its very nature and gravitates, on the one hand, toward the proletariat and democracy while, on the other, toward the reactionary classes, in an effort to hold back history. . . . And is capable of making alliances with the ruling classes against the proletariat for the sake of strengthening its position as petty owners" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 2, p 454).

Despite all changes in the origins, strength, structure, and features of the petite bourgeoisie, it has retained its former two-faced nature.

Problems involving the strategy and tactics of the proletariat toward the modern middle classes are an important problem facing the international communist movement. Its solution calls for the all-round consideration of all changes in the size and social and professional structure and the economic, political, ideological, and organizational situation of such strata, their social role in modern bourgeois society, and their class maturity.

General democratic requirements--democratization of political life, elimination of dictatorial systems, prevention of war, cessation of the arms race and economic militarization, and the establishment of a durable peace are, above all, the base for an alliance between the proletariat and the middle classes. The importance of such requirements in engaging in joint actions and achieving unity in the struggle for common objectives is unquestionable.

However, everything points out that the modern intermediary stratum could join the Marxists in a solid alliance only if the long-term future of such an alliance is clear, and depending on what its basis will be after the democratic stage. Without reciprocal trust on this basic problem, by virtue of their class nature and interest the new and old groups of the middle classes would rather become temporary fellow travelers of the proletariat at the stage of democratic changes, rapidly converting into quite decisive enemies of the proletariat in the case of a conversion to socialist changes in which they have been indoctrinated to see a threat to their interests. The concentration of big masses of modern intermediary strata in the cities, information mobility, and existence of their own ideological and organizational centers, as well as the active measures taken by monopoly capitalism to use this segment of the population in its own interest facilitate this process and raise particularly sharply the question of the factors determining the duration of an anti-monopoly alliance facing the entire revolutionary movement.

The modern petite bourgeoisie can not fully satisfy the democratic slogan of struggle against the monopolies since, first of all, its very reproduction, functioning, and protection of its savings are now linked with monopoly capital. Secondly, it does not accept merely the negative aspect of the struggle --undermining the monopolies--without a positive alternative after this goal has been attained.

In turn, the interests of the proletariat can not be limited merely to measures whose final objective is to improve the situation of the petite bourgeoisie on a capitalist basis. Historical experience confirms that the serious and firm alliance between the proletariat, headed by the communists, and the middle classes could be achieved only through the type of reorganization of economic activities and living conditions of small businessmen which would make them independent of the monopolies and give them, as working people, a reliable and secure possibility for normal activities and existence.

Examples of such work done by the communists are found in the "red provinces" in Italy and some parts of France. However, they are still few and apply only to individual strata of the middle classes. The gaining of proper experience and its attentive analysis and all-round expansion are the most reliable ways for the development of a strong alliance between the working class and the intermediary strata, an alliance which would be capable, in the future, to withstand the trials in the course of all the stages of the establishment of true popular democracy and of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism.

5003
CSO: 1802

LATIN AMERICA: NEW ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 108-119

[Article by V. Bushuyev, and Yu. Kozlov]

[Text] Latin America today is the arena of a fierce confrontation between the forces of progress and reaction. The democratic and anti-imperialist movement is spreading to an ever greater extent in all the countries of the continent. New social strata are joining the revolutionary process. The battles of the proletariat are developing and the struggle waged by the broad popular masses in defense of their national independence and sovereignty and for progressive changes is intensifying.

One of the prerequisites for the acceleration of the revolutionary process here is a very grave socioeconomic crisis. It was triggered by the irreconcilable contradiction between the needs of development and the social system predominating on the continent. The domination of American imperialism and the preservation of obsolete semi-feudal structures have distorted the features of dependent Latin American capitalism.

The political and social trends inherent in the present epoch are becoming ever more apparent in Latin America. This applies to international relations as well. Under the influence of objective and subjective factors, the ruling circles of many countries in the area are reevaluating their traditional course of taking the United States as a basis for comparison. Today the Latin American countries are displaying their aspiration to strengthen their political autonomy and economic independence not singly but on a broad front. This includes the broadening of mutually profitable relations with the Soviet Union and the socialist world as a whole. As a result, they are playing an ever greater role in international life despite the counteractions of imperialism and its servants.

I.

The Latin American countries have long been the subject of particular interest of foreign, American above all, monopoly capital. Of late this interest has become even greater. This is reflected, in particular, in the growth

of direct private U.S. capital investments in the economy of Latin American countries. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, whereas in 1973 they totalled 16.4 billion, in 1975 they had risen to \$22.2 billion. The American monopolies take for themselves one-fifth of the gross national product of the area and one-third of its export income. The overall amount of funds they take out of Latin America greatly exceeds the influx of new direct investments. Foreign trade, characterized by an uneven pace and one-sided orientation of most countries on the continent toward the U.S. market, is causing irreparable harm to their national economy. According to data which the United Nations Economic and Social Council published in October 1976, the trade deficit of Latin American countries (excluding petroleum exporters) had reached \$11 billion, while their foreign indebtedness totalled almost \$70 billion. As pointed out in "Financial Markets of the World," a book published in the United States, the biggest debtors are Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, and Chile.

Latin America's economic and financial dependence offers imperialism the possibility to shift to the Latin American working people a considerable share of the burden of the financial crisis experienced by the developed capitalist countries. Stimulating inflation and higher living costs, imperialist rule leads to the impoverishment of the masses. The peoples of this continent which have, essentially, world famous minerals and huge areas of fertile land, find themselves doomed to poverty and cultural backwardness.

The experience of many countries on the continent convincingly proves that the structural socioeconomic crisis can not be resolved through palliatives, with the help of superficial bourgeois initiatives. History, as was noted in the Declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin American and Caribbean Countries (Havana, 1975), "proved that the true way for the development of the Latin American countries lies not in capitulationist reformism or 'aid' from the monopolies, but the display of political resolve to gain economic independence and undertake profound changes."

A characteristic feature of the revolutionary process in the Latin American countries is its broad social base and the existence of a large and politically conscious working class. The other social forces of the anti-imperialist front, including peasant, and radical middle and petite bourgeois urban strata, supporting the defense of national interests and democracy, are rallying around the working class and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard.

The struggle waged by the proletariat and the other democratic and anti-imperialist forces on the continent is becoming ever more frequently interwoven, to a greater or lesser extent, with systematic actions in defense of the economic and political autonomy launched by some circles of the national-reformist and nationalist bourgeoisie. These circles are interested in the establishment of governmental control over natural resources and key economic sectors (Venezuela), and measures aimed at revising the unequal economic cooperation and thus contributing to the strengthening of the positions of national capital (Mexico). Therefore, the experience of Latin America

reasserts the correctness of Lenin's view according to which "one of the most basic characteristics of imperialism is precisely the fact that it accelerates the development of capitalism in the most backward countries, thus broadening and activating the struggle against national oppression" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 30, p 132).

As throughout the world, the radical changes in the ratio of class forces in the world arena in favor of socialism, the general changes in the climate of international relations today, and the trend toward a further abatement of tension and normalization and development of intergovernmental relations on an equal and mutually profitable basis, affect circumstances in Latin America to an ever growing extent. The victories of progressive and anti-imperialist forces in Asia and Africa are exerting a revolutionizing influence as well.

"The changes in Latin America," the Declaration of the Conference of Communist Parties of Latin American and Caribbean Countries pointed out, "are part of the worldwide process developing toward social progress which is taking place in our epoch of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism." The Cuban Revolution and the creation of the first socialist state in the Western hemisphere are the most vivid manifestation of such changes. The revolution in Cuba marked a sharp turn in the struggle against the domination of imperialism on the continent, ascribing it a considerably broader and deeper nature. It had, and retains, a great influence on international life. The solidarity displayed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries toward Cuba contributed to the fact that despite long years of adamant imperialist efforts to suppress the Cuban Revolution, it became an irreversible social factor in Latin American reality.

Major successes were achieved by the revolutionary-liberation forces in Peru. The process of reorganization in that country led to substantial changes in the economic aspect of that country and to considerable changes in the social and political role of the working class and the working people. The anti-imperialist struggle in Panama is intensifying. Positive changes are taking place in the Venezuela where the state has taken over iron ore and petroleum extraction which were previously entirely in the hands of foreign monopoly trusts. The working people and the democratic and patriotic forces of Ecuador, Honduras, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guiana, and other countries are struggling for the social and economic liberation of the people's masses, control over natural resources in their countries, democratic agrarian reform, democratization of national life, and total sovereignty and independence.

Meanwhile, the situation of countries victims of the conspiracy of domestic and foreign reactionary forces, such as Chile and Uruguay, remains exceptionally complex. Imperialism continues to control the domestic and foreign policies of the dictatorial regimes in Paraguay, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Haiti. An extremely tense situation remains in Argentina where, spreading terror and violence, the rightwing forces are trying to break the resistance of the people's masses and turn the country back into a satellite of North American imperialism. Imperialism is making particular efforts to keep within the orbit of its influence the biggest Latin American country--Brazil.

II.

The ever more frequent shifting of the front of the struggle to the area of international relations is a characteristic feature of the present stage in the struggle waged by the Latin American peoples for full national liberation and for strengthening their sovereignty.

Detente offers new possibilities to the forces of national liberation, democracy, and socialism in Latin America. It encourages the resolve of the peoples (as well as of the realistically thinking bourgeois leaders of some countries) to oppose imperialist intrigues and to create the necessary external conditions in the struggle for the restructuring of national economic relations on an equal footing, and for strengthening national sovereignty.

The time is past when the foreign political course of all Latin American countries without exception was formulated in Washington. The development of the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples, and the increased independence of the Latin American countries take ever more inefficient U.S. controlled organs such as the Organization of American States (OAS) which, only recently, operated on the continent as an "instrument" for the preservation of "freedom and democracy," in their imperialist understanding, from the "communist menace." As the Declaration of the Havana Conference of Communist Parties noted, the OAS, "created by Washington essentially as a colonial department for Latin America, is losing any factual effectiveness for imperialism. Unquestionably, this is the consequence of the struggle waged by the peoples and the proletariat of these countries and their middle classes, as well as the vivid example of revolutionary Cuba."

As a result of the successes of the policy of detente and the factual exposure of the myth of a "communist menace," the governments of a number of Latin American countries are substantially revising their former concepts, imposed by imperialism, concerning "the threat of aggression and external subversion." The problem of national security is undergoing major modifications. An ever larger number of countries on the continent are reaching the conclusion that their security depends, above all, on economic and social development. Awareness is growing in Latin America of the fact that true economic development, so acutely needed by all countries on the continent, as well as defense of national sovereignty and the right to dispose independently of one's resources, are impossible without the adoption of decisive measures aimed at protecting national economies from uncontrolled activities of materialist monopolies or without joint efforts in the struggle against the common imperialist menace.

The contribution of the Latin American countries to the process of reorganization of international relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence and cooperation among countries with different social systems is growing. The economic, trade, scientific and technical, and cultural cooperation between many Latin American countries and the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity is strengthening. The coordination of actions

between a number of Latin American countries and other independent countries is growing. The countries on the continent are energizing their participation in the nonalignment movement. All such positive phenomena can not fail to please the democratic and patriotic circles in Latin America and the progressive and peace-loving forces the world over. Pointing out in the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th Party Congress the expanded relations between the USSR and Latin American countries, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that "we are supporting the aspiration of these countries to strengthen their political autonomy and economic independence and welcome their increased role in international life."

The changing role of Latin American countries in the world arena and the independent foreign policy pursued by a number of countries on the continent are one of the important links in achieving socioeconomic progress here. Such a policy, in the view of the Latin American communists and all progressive forces, could and should become a major means for achieving economic independence and for the use of natural resources to promote the material and cultural renaissance of the people. Therefore, using foreign political levers, it is a question of developing possibilities for resolving vital domestic problems facing Latin American countries.

The tasks of achieving true effectiveness and consistency in resolving problems of independent economic and political development adamantly call for the unification of all anti-imperialist, anti-dictatorial, and anti-oligarchic forces in the Latin American countries within national fronts and the unification of the progressive forces on the scale of the entire continent. Unquestionably, such a unification, for which the communists are tirelessly fighting, will contribute to strengthening the positions of the patriotic and anti-imperialist regimes, their resolve to oppose the intrigues of domestic and international reaction, and to implement proclaimed as yet unimplemented reform plans and intensify the initiated yet slowed down, for one or another reason, process of change. The energizing of the struggle for an independent foreign political course, peace, and detente in countries under military-police regimes, helps to strengthen the positions of the proletariat and its political vanguard and to achieving unity of action with radical urban middle classes, patriotic groups within the armed forces, and even that part of the national bourgeoisie which is unrelated to foreign monopoly capital, i.e., forces interested in the restoration of democratic freedoms and the implementation of vital socioeconomic changes.

The dialectics of development of the world revolutionary process is such that its successes also energize the actions of the most reactionary bourgeois circles whose arsenal of tools and scope of maneuvering are being noticeably reduced under the present world circumstances. Losing their mass base, deprived to an ever greater extent of the opportunity to use the discredited methods of toothless reformism, fabrications related to the "communist menace" and other means of fraud and moral disarmament of the masses, the forces of international reaction are resorting to the most barbaric methods for suppressing the liberation struggle of the peoples,

and the establishment of fascist systems in countries taking steps toward independence and progress. "The most progressive movement of our epoch, particularly when its activities are manifested in political categories such as detente," said Comrade Arismendi, Communist Party of Uruguay Central Committee first secretary, "is influencing the situation in the individual countries and turning into a catalyzing of the future of the nations. Yet, what would happen to us were we to forget Lenin's axiom that a revolution triggers counter-revolution and vice versa! . . . Even though historically positive changes in the world arena are favorable to the revolution in individual countries, such achievements . . . could be accompanied by preventive or responding, yet no less real, actions on the part of the counter-revolution, actions which could temporarily be successful in various parts of the world."

The pro-imperialist groups of big landowners, the conciliationist bourgeoisie, and other local reactionary forces remain strong in a number of Latin American countries. For the sake of the preservation of their own privileges, they ally themselves to and cooperate with the foreign monopolies. Nevertheless, the trend toward a sovereign foreign policy is becoming determining to an ever greater extent, and is strengthening with every passing day.

III.

The origins of the situation developing in Latin America should be sought in the processes which developed on the continent during the 1960's. The successes of the Cuban Revolution, and the failure of the attempts of the local and international reaction to stop its progress inspired the broad democratic strata in all Latin American countries in their struggle against foreign oppressors. Washington was faced with the need to review its tactics and to adapt the former policy to the new realities.

At that point the imperialist politicians formulated a plan for superficial reforms aimed at encouraging the capitalist development of Latin American countries controlled by U.S. monopoly capitalism. This plan was expressed in the 1961 program of the so-called Alliance for Progress. The purpose of the program was to weaken the increasing discontent with U.S. neocolonialist policy, and to convince the Latin American peoples that all countries on the Western Hemisphere had common interests and of Washington's wish to contribute to Latin American progress.

Reality struck a violent blow at the illusions of those who fell for the demagogic idea of the "noble mission of the monopolies." In the majority of cases the broadly publicized social reforms remained on paper only. The scant allocations granted by the United States in accordance with the Alliance for Progress program could not be compared to the profits which the North American monopolies continued to extract from the Latin American countries.

At the end of the 1960's, as before, the national income of the majority of countries on the continent was accumulating in the hands of the oligarchy accounting for an insignificant percentage of the population. The

situation of the toiling masses was becoming ever more difficult. Unemployment was increasing. The cost of living was growing rapidly while real wages were declining. The overwhelming majority of Latin American countries had not even undertaken the solution of vital socioeconomic problems.

According to H. Connell-Smith, a British specialist on inter-American relations, by 1969 the Alliance for Progress had totally discredited itself. In his words, the Latin Americans had become convinced through practical experience that "there could be no profound economic and social changes in Latin America as long as the area remained so dependent on the United States." Discontent with imperialist policy spread not only among the broad toiling masses and the middle urban classes but among the national bourgeois strata who were experiencing the fierce blows dealt by imperialism and were being ruined by the oligarchy--the monopolists, the big bourgeoisie, and the landowners.

As early as the middle of the 1960's a reassessment of values and of foreign policy directions was undertaken by various Latin American countries. Many countries on the continent gradually began to identify their interests with those of other developing states. On the eve of the first United Nations Trade and Development Conference (UNCTAD), held in Geneva, in 1964, despite the obvious disapproval and even opposition of the United States, the Latin American countries held a meeting of their representatives in Alta Gracia (Argentina) to formulate their joint position.

Great attention began to be paid to problems of intra-Latin American trade and economic integration aimed at guaranteeing common development interests. Between 1960 and 1970 intra-American trade rose from 7.9 percent to approximately 12 percent of the overall volume of regional trade. By 1975, according to the UN Economic Commission for Latin America, it had reached 15 percent.

Two events which took place in 1969 were scheduled to play a major role in the restructuring of inter-American economic and political relations. An agreement on the establishment of a joint economic group of five countries--Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru--was signed in Cartagena, a Colombian city. Venezuela joined it in 1973. The signatories to the Cartagena Accord stated that their objective was to ensure through joint efforts the harmonious development of economy of their countries and, above all, their balanced industrial development by restricting the activities of foreign monopolies. In May 1969 a charter was adopted at a conference of the Special Latin American Coordination Commission (SECLA), held in Vina del Mar (Chile). It contained demands such as the elimination of quota systems restricting imports of Latin American goods to the United States and granting them trade preferences; elimination of loan conditions which limited Latin American purchases to the expensive North American market; easing the burden of indebtedness; abandonment of the U.S. practice of dumping in terms of goods exported to Latin America, and so on. The charter stressed the need for continental unity without which improvements in conditions governing international trade could not be achieved.

This marked the beginning of the process of the withdrawal by a large number of Latin American countries from their former positions of subordination and dependence. "The rebirth of Latin American unity," described in recent years by the American press, is manifested in demands of not only to eliminate discriminatory provisions in U.S. trade legislation, but to abandon the bankrupt policy of isolating Cuba, restricting the omnipotence of multi-national monopolies, acknowledging the principles of non-interference in domestic affairs, and ensuring the full participation of Latin American countries in the solution of continental worldwide problems.

The beginning of the 1970's was marked by a wave of nationalizations of American monopoly property in Latin America. The considerable diversification of economic and trade relations maintained by Latin American countries, the intensive drawing of capital from other parts of the world, and the development of mutually profitable cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are contributing to the undermining of U.S. hegemony.

Starting with the 1970's, a situation developed within the OAS which, ever more frequently, the United States is in the minority and, occasionally, stands alone in the solution of one or another political or economic problem.

In 1975, despite the opposition of the United States and its satellites, the conference of OAS Ministers of Foreign Affairs, held in San Jose (Costa Rica) voted in favor of the abolishment of anti-Cuban sanctions applied by this organization in 1964 under Washington's pressure. The factual "sanctions" had been eliminated long before that decision. One after another Peru, Argentina, Colombia, Panama, Venezuela, and other countries on the continent had established diplomatic and trade relations with Cuba.

The creation of the Latin American economic system, whose constituent treaty was concluded in October 1975 in Panama by representatives of 25 Latin American and Caribbean countries, including socialist Cuba, was of major importance. The main objectives of this organization, which excluded the participation of the United States, was to develop close cooperation among Latin American countries and protect their interests from encroachments by foreign monopolies. The organization members proclaimed their intention to set up Latin American multilateral enterprises, to contribute to the industrialization of their countries and cooperate in the manufacturing and marketing of goods, formulate a united policy in the field of prices of exported raw materials, and to coordinate positions in the international arena.

The Latin American countries assumed a clear and consistent position in terms of the struggle waged by the people and government of Panama for the elimination of the U.S. colonial enclave in that country's territory and the restoration of its sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone. The Canal problem had long exceeded the limits of bilateral relations between the United States and Panama within which American diplomacy had tried to contain it by all possible forces. Panama's demand for the restoration of its sovereignty over the Canal was supported at the United Nations Security Council session

of March 1973 not only by all Latin American countries, but by the representatives of the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries, and a number of Asian and African states.

The economic and commercial cooperation between these countries and the socialist states, growing with every passing year, plays an important role in strengthening the autonomy of Latin American countries. At the end of 1976 a number of accords were concluded in Lima, stipulating the further development of mutually profitable Soviet-Peruvian relations. Considerable process was achieved in trade-economic and scientific and technical cooperation between the Soviet Union and Argentina. In the course of the official visit to the USSR paid by Venezuelan President C. Andres Perez, in November 1976, an agreement was concluded covering economic and industrial cooperation between the two countries. Soviet-Mexican relations are developing on the basis of friendship and mutual understanding and the strengthening of peace and cooperation. In the course of the last two or three years the Soviet Union and Mexico have concluded more intergovernmental and other agreements than throughout the entire post-war period. The official visit which Mexican President J. Lopez Portillo paid to the USSR last May provided a new impetus to the strengthening and expansion of relations between the two countries. Trade relations between the Soviet Union and Brazil, Colombia, Guiana, Costa Rica, and other countries are developing successfully. An agreement on cooperation between Mexico and CEMA has been concluded.

In accordance with its basic line of preventing the threat of a nuclear war, last May our country decided to sign an additional second protocol to the Treaty on the Banning of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, assuming the obligation to respect the status of the Latin American continent as a nuclear-free zone. " . . . As we assume," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out, "this step will contribute to the strengthening and development of friendly relations with the Latin American countries."

The rapprochement between a number of Latin American and Caribbean countries with other developing countries and their increasingly frequent joint actions on many subjects seriously concern imperialism. "These countries," a group of leading American Latin Americanists noted in the book "The New Internationalism of Latin America," "are, it seems, convinced that their interests are coinciding more closely with those of other developing countries than those of the United States." The United States, THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote, is also concerned with extension of the influence of the nonalignment movement among Latin American and Caribbean countries.

The policies of a number of Latin American countries within the United Nations and its specialized organs is becoming ever less dependent on the United States. The charter of economic rights and obligations of states, adopted at the 29th United Nations General Assembly, and the declaration on the establishment of a new international economic order, in whose elaboration the Latin American countries made a great contribution, Mexico and Venezuela in particular, adopted at the 6th Special United Nations General Assembly Session, reflect the new ratio of forces in the world and the result of the lengthy struggle of the peoples.

IV.

The aggravation of contradictions between the majority of Latin American countries and the United States, and the intensifying trend toward the unification of efforts by the countries on the continent in order to counter jointly the expansion of foreign monopolies dictate to the ruling U.S. circles the need for ways for reducing frictions with Latin America and the elaboration of new ways and means to conceal their policy. Fearing, under present-day circumstances, openly to oppose on the governmental level the independent line pursued by the Latin American countries, the reactionary U.S. imperialist circles are using as their main shock force the multinational monopolies or the international financial organizations they control. They rely mainly on the use of economic pressure--artificial lowering of prices on world markets of traditional Latin American exports, use of foreign debts as a means of pressure, and even the organization of subversive activities by intelligence services and their local stooges, and the promotion of terrorism and violence.

According to the book "The CIA without a Mask," published in Argentina, the U.S. imperialist circles have assumed the prerogative of "destabilizing" any government deemed incompatible with U.S. "national interests." Such "destabilization" is accomplished with the help of complex and unprecedented methods of economic, political, and military subversion. In their time Bolivia, Chile, and Argentina have been its targets. Currently attempts are undertaken to create chaos in the economic and political life of Peru, Panama, Guiana, Jamaica, and other countries.

Let us note that in recent years a conflict between two opposite trends has been clearly manifested within the circles which formulate and implement U.S.-Latin American policy. A realistic trend reflects the position of those who call for taking modern reality into consideration, countering the forces unable to part with the myths and illusions of the past or take into consideration the new realities on the continent.

On the one hand are the soberly thinking circles who call for facing the facts and drawing conclusions from the changes which have taken place in Latin America. They are in favor of meeting the demands of the Latin American countries in the field of economics and for abandoning the senseless policy of Cuban blockade.

Precisely such recommendations, aimed at abandoning the view that Latin America is within the U.S. "sphere of influence," that are found, for example, in the paper "American in the Changing World," prepared at the Center for Inter-American Studies and a number of other American organizations. Ever more frequently statements are heard indicating the near-sightedness and potential danger of the policy aimed at the unconditional support of anti-national and essentially fascist systems ruling a number of Latin American countries. "The United States," emphasized the well-known American diplomat Charles Yost in THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, "no longer

needs to support or provide significant aid to authoritarian regimes only because they are anti-communist and hold a strategically important position. Modern historical experience shows that many such regimes are short-lived and that those who have identified with them could be rejected by their successors."

The report of the commission on relations between the United States and Latin America, headed by S. Linowitz, former U.S. Ambassador to the OAS, also called for the creation of a new base for cooperation with the Latin American states. The paper points out the need for the U.S. government immediately to proclaim that it respects the sovereignty of each Latin American country and its pledge not to undertake unilateral military or secret intervention in its domestic affairs, seek means for the resumption of the process of normalizing relations with Cuba, resolving the problem of the fluctuation of raw material prices, and so on.

Such statements and appeals are a reflection of both the new deployment of forces in Latin America as well as radical changes in the international arena. However, groups opposing any step in a positive direction based on true equality and acknowledgment of the realities on the continent, continuing to nurture the hope that the former order which prevailed in the inter-American system during the cold-war period could be restored through secret pressure, maneuvering, and subversive activities, remain quite strong and influential within the United States.

The U.S. reactionary imperialist circles are doing everything possible to keep the peoples of Latin America away from the main way of human development and from the extension to this continent of the beneficial influence of detente and of the development of cooperation among countries belonging to different social systems. U.S. monopoly capital which is extracting billions in profits from Latin America is against any step toward easing trade conditions with the Latin American countries and is opposing their true industrialization. Using various means the extreme rightwing forces in the United States tried to prevent the Senate ratification of the new treaties on the Panama Canal and to retain loopholes for interfering in the Panamanian domestic affairs.

As in the past, imperialist actions in Latin America are motivated by the fear of the unification among the Latin American countries and the belief that the United States could have a greater influence on the continent as long as such countries are not united. The U.S. reactionary and aggressive imperialist circles are applying tremendous efforts to divide the Latin American countries and intensify the differences between them, so that the unification and solidarity within Latin America remain the "unfulfilled dream of Latin American state leaders," as stated by THE NEW YORK TIMES. The reaction is using tried methods for weakening unity such as encouraging ideological differences, promoting caveman anti-communism, increasing the tension in connection with border arguments among Peru and Chile and Bolivia, Venezuela and Colombia, and Salvador and Honduras, artificially promoting rivalry between Brazil and Argentina and between Venezuela and Mexico, and pitting the industrially more developed against the less developed countries in the area.

Promoting the implementation of its objectives in Latin America, the United States relies on the most reactionary forces and regimes, as eloquently confirmed by its relations with Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, Guatemala, and other countries. In particular, the Chilean military-fascist junta is being used ever more frequently as the "trojan horse" of imperialism, the OAS, the Latin American Economic System, the Andian group, and other international organizations of Latin American countries.

Another direction followed in U.S. diplomatic activities, aimed at subverting Latin American unity, is its adamant aspiration to consider the problems of the continent on a bilateral basis. In this case the United States ascribes particular attention to strengthening relations with those it considers "key countries" on the continent, Brazil above all. The United States has publicly granted that country "a new role on a worldwide scale" and established with it a system of permanent consultations similar to the ones between the United States and the countries of Western Europe, Canada, and Japan. According to the Latin American press the clear purpose of this step is to divide the Latin American countries, plant suspicion among them, and trigger rivalries.

There is something symbolic in the fact that the only "source of hope" for American diplomacy is, according to the French newspaper LE MONDE, Washington's reliance on centripetal forces in Latin America which could suddenly turn out to be "more powerful than the desire for unity. . . . In fact, the United States has no other solution to propose." Having no positive program for the real reorganization of inter-American relations, and fearing any change on the continent, imperialism is displaying ever more clearly its desire to install openly terroristic and fascist regimes in a number of countries which are now becoming its support in the Western Hemisphere. It is encouraging terrorism and violence against all progressive and democratic forces. The United States not only granted aid to the Chilean military-fascist junta and to other reactionary systems in Latin America but is supporting the appeals of U.S. puppets such as Stroessner, the dictator of Paraguay, and Pinochet, the head of the Chilean Junta, who called for the creation of an "anti-communist alliance" in South America--a South Atlantic pact, as described by the reactionary press.

It would be difficult to expect of U.S. monopoly circles to agree to any kind of significant changes in Washington's policy toward a continent which, as seen by leading American experts, is of "vital importance" and ever growing significance to them. However, it could be assumed that the ways and means for the implementation of this policy will change and adapt to the new circumstances and the realities of Latin America (as of other developing countries and the world at large) which could be denied no longer.

This was confirmed, in particular, by the trip which U.S. President J. Carter made to Venezuela and Brazil last March. Even though Carter's trip was used for purposes of loudly proclaiming, once again, some kind of new program in relations between the United States and Latin American countries, in fact,

the "new" approach contained essentially nothing new or practical. According to the Mexican newspaper EL DIA, its purpose was to strengthen American economic control over developing countries. The introduction by the Carter administration of restrictions on imports from Latin American countries of a number of goods, sugar above all, was a new proof of the deep gap between the words and the actions of the U.S. government concerning Latin America. In May EL CORREO, the Peruvian newspaper, described with full justification such measures as the "regular attempt" on the part of the neighbor from the north "to shift to the Latin American countries and the other developing states the burden of the crisis experienced by the entire capitalist system."

Despite the difficulties and temporary defeats suffered at one or another sector by the progressive, democratic, and patriotic forces, and despite all contradictions and, frequently, inconsistencies in the foreign political actions of Latin American countries, determined by the class affiliation of their ruling circles, the strengthened autonomy of the countries on the continent and the new role they are beginning to play in international life are of major historical significance.

The positive shifts made in the foreign policies of Latin American countries confirm the fact that the many-faceted process of social changes, whose beginning was laid by the Cuban Revolution itself, is continuing to grow. This process has never been, nor could be, simple and direct. " . . . To conceive of world history as developing smoothly and precisely ahead, without sometimes gigantic leaps backwards, would be non-dialectical, unscientific, and theoretically wrong," V. I. Lenin said ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 30, p 6).

The processes developing in Latin America may experience other upsurges and declines or assume a great variety of forms. However, no one could block their progress.

5003
CSO: 1802

ETERNALLY VITAL AND DEVELOPING DOCTRINE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 120-122

[Review by V. Poshatayev, candidate of philosophical sciences, of the book "Marksizm v XX Veke. Marks, Engel's, Lenin i Sovremennost'" [Marxism in the 20th Century. Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and the Present], by P. N. Fedoseyev. Second expanded edition, Mysl', Moscow, 1977, 638 pp]

[Text] The study of the growing influence of Marxism-Leninism in our complex and contradictory century is one of the main directions in progressive social thought. The works of the noted Soviet social scientist academician P. N. Fedoseyev are making a substantial contribution to the development of this direction. For many years this scientist, whose 70th birthday will be celebrated this month, has fruitfully studied the historical destinies and development of Marxist-Leninist theory. His writings are part of the theoretical stock actively used in scientific and ideological work.

The publication in 1972 of P. N. Fedoseyev's fundamental study "Marksizm v XX Veke. Marks, Engel's, Lenin i Sovremennost," was a major scientific event. The work was highly rated by the scientific public. Covering a broad range of problems from the appearance of Marxism to the present, the book offered a broad picture of the historical development of Marxist-Leninist ideas and their revolutionary-transforming role, inseparably linked with the socio-historical process and the basic problems of our time.

Life, however, does not stand still and the scientist continues his creative effort, closely looking at the new phenomena in reality. The time since the first edition was marked by most important historical events and intensive party theoretical work reflected, above all, in the materials of the 25th CPSU Congress and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's speeches. Continuing the creative elaboration of basic problems of Marxist-Leninist theory, P. N. Fedoseyev responds to these events in the second edition of his book expanded by new summations in the light of the decisions of the 25th Congress. Now the scientist focuses his attention on the theoretical problems of developed socialism and the building of communism, discussed in a new chapter.

Describing the theory of the developed socialist society, elaborated by the CPSU in the course of creative cooperation with the fraternal communist parties, the author shows the organic links between this theory and the general course of social progress and the historical development of Marxism-Leninism. The new sections of the book are the logical extension of the systematic and painstaking work of the first edition. Furthermore, they enable us to perceive far more completely and extensively the contents of the other parts of the book which consider a broad set of problems related to the establishment of a revolutionary proletarian outlook and the development of Marx's and Engels' scientific communism, the characterization of Leninism as the Marxism of our epoch, the study of the historical experience of the Great October Revolution, the leading role of the CPSU in the building of socialism and communism, the historical lessons of the victory over fascism, and others. This is natural, for the powerful tree to which the author compares Marxism-Leninism became even more widespread during that time and its roots sunk even more deeply in the ground of reality, while its mutual ties with history became even more organic and stronger.

The theory of the developed socialist society is the legitimate result of the entire historical past of the creative enrichment of Marxism which always elaborated new ideas not through abstract-scholastic theorizing but through the dialectical study of the facts of real life in their totality and their historical ties and development. The theory of developed socialism is the result of the use in analyzing the contemporary problems of our society of the entire creative Marxist potential, a use which multiplies its potential. P. N. Fedoseyev shows the link between this concept and the classical concepts of Marx and Lenin on the phases of development of the communist socio-economic system, the dialectics of the conversion from socialism to communism, the correlation between economics and politics, the social nature of scientific and technical progress, and the world revolutionary process. Showing the place and role of the theory of developed socialism in the overall system of Marxist-Leninist ideas, its international theoretical and practical significance, and the power it contains to influence the minds of millions of people throughout the world, the author describes most convincingly the nature of this major contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory. P. N. Fedoseyev specifically shows the way the 25th CPSU Congress, providing a comprehensive description of the developed socialist society in the USSR, precisely formulated the tasks related to its improvement in the various areas of social life, developing and concretizing the concepts expressed at the previous, 24th, congress. The contribution made by the Leninist party to the treasury of scientific communism, the author notes, is its summation of the great historical experience of our country, the achievements of world socialism, and the elevation of the historical experience of the popular masses to a level of theory.

One of the most important lessons drawn from this experience is the historical need for a dictatorship of the proletariat, irrefutably proved by the practice of the class struggle and the building of socialism. It is precisely the dictatorship of the proletariat that ensures an incomparably higher form of

democracy compared with bourgeois democracy. It is precisely in the course of the process of dialectical development of the socialist statehood that, at the mature socialist stage, when the problems of a conversion to communism await their immediate solution, that the dictatorship of the proletariat grows into a state of the whole people. This stage is marked by a new and higher blossoming of democracy whose further development makes particularly topical today Engels' strong and precise words: "Democracy today means communism. Any other democracy may exist only in the heads of theoretical clairvoyants who have nothing in common with real events" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 2, p 589).

Factual events and the viewpoint of life and practical experience are the positions adopted by P. N. Fedoseyev throughout his work in the assessment of facts and ideas. In this connection particularly noteworthy is his method for criticizing our ideological opponents, systematically used in the book. He pits against their conjectures and chimeras arising in their heads the phenomena and processes of factual contemporary history. The logic of Marxist-Leninist ideas is the logic of things, the logic of socio-historical development and of the revolutionary-transforming activities of the masses. Facts can be countered only by facts rather than mirages of "theoretical clairvoyance." P. N. Fedoseyev brilliantly proves in his book that the claims of the ideological opponents of Marxism-Leninism are totally unable to withstand this "eye-to-eye confrontation." Parties describing themselves socialist, social democratic, or workers', yet standing on the positions of conciliation with the bourgeoisie, have either been frequently in power or, one way or another, have shared the power. Thus, the author writes, in the course of the 20th century German social democrats have been members of cabinets 13 times and have even headed cabinets on 7 occasions; in Britain the labor party has had cabinet ministers on 7 occasions and headed 5 governments; in France socialists have participated in 17 cabinets while in Sweden they remained continually in power for a period of 44 years. For many years they have carried along the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat, promising to convert capitalism into socialism through evolution. "The moment the ruling bourgeois class and international imperialism would consider doubtful the intentions and actions of the supporters of 'democratic socialism,' using either 'peaceful'--parliamentary--or violent--through various pressure methods--they were removed from their ministerial positions" (p 467).

Concretely proving the aggressive power of Marxist-Leninist ideas, the author pits against the conjectures of the ideological opponents of revolutionary creative Marxism the study of the real facts of existing socialism and the broad range of its features, development trends, historical advantages, and factual rather than imaginary theoretical and practical problems. The expanded description of the mature socialist society as a whole is combined in the book with the study of its individual theoretical problems--economic, socio-political, and spiritual, and problems of the socialist way of life. The comprehensive characterization of the material

and technical base of developed socialism, and the definition of its criteria and trends of improvement, and its radical characteristics and qualitative differences between it and the essentially built material and technical base of socialism are of major scientific importance. This radical characteristic "is that it may be possible and necessary to resolve on a comprehensive basis production and social problems, while accomplishing a profound economic change in the solution of the variety of problems related to upgrading the people's prosperity" (p 591). The author describes the intensified social orientation of national economic plans as an objective law of developed socialism. The enhanced level of socialization and organization of the production process, the establishment of production and scientific-production associations, the ever-broader dissemination of big agroindustrial enterprises, the creation of territorial-production complexes, the profound changes accomplished in the social structure, and the rapprochement among classes, social groups, nations, and nationalities, proving the dynamics of our society, the development of socialist democracy, and the increased leading role of the communist party and improved socialist way of life, as well as other phenomena in the economic, social, political, and cultural areas are considered in the book in terms of their inner relations and interdependence characterizing the developed socialist society as an integral social organism.

P. N. Fedoseyev's book includes a fruitful attempt to clarify a number of so far controversial problems. This includes, for example, the problem of the economic role of the state under developed socialist conditions. Emphasizing the complexity of the processes occurring in the economic life of the country, the author notes that in the familiar debate the formulation of this problem was largely abstract even though it led to the determination of a number of important aspects. Using the basic ideas of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he formulates his own methodological approach. " . . . It is not a question of the fact that the state is no longer the superstructure and has converted, to one or another extent, into the base, allegedly becoming its component," the author writes. "It is not a question of abstractly pitting the state as a 'form of ideological relations' against 'material relations' as a base. The main thing is concretely to reveal the dialectics of interaction between the superstructure and the base and between the state and economic development in the socialist society" (p 610). The author adopts a similar approach in the discussion of the complex theoretical problems of the socialist way of life, emphasizing that the main prerequisite for the proper understanding of the matter is, above all, the establishment of dialectical interaction between human material conditions and activities. Reducing problems of the way of life to a given category ("conditions" or "behavior") not only simplifies the very problem but distorts its essence, for, in terms of the Marxist-Leninist understanding, the main thing here is a coincidence between changed circumstances and human activities in revolutionary practice. The establishment of such dialectics is also a vital theoretical problem, "for this is an initial point for understanding the ways of practically assisting the establishment of a socialist way of life" (p 614).

The author describes extensively and thoroughly the increased leading role of the communist party in the building of communism as the most important general historical law. "The process of building a new socialist society," he writes, "is taking place in each country within forms stipulated by its specific historical characteristics. However, this entire variety of specific forms obeys general laws, first among which is the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist parties. This is determined by the fact that the working class holds the position of the leading force in the socialist production system and social relations and, correspondingly, in the political life of society. It is precisely through its parties that the working class exercises a decisive influence on the shaping and development of socialism and communism. The role of the proletarian vanguard consists of the political education and involvement in the building of a new life of the broadest possible strata of the working class, toiling peasantry, and people's intelligentsia" (p 479). Expanding this thought, P. N. Fedoseyev notes: "The idea of the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist parties is of great importance. It sums up the revolutionary-transforming activities of the communists heading the movement of toiling mankind on the path of social and cultural progress and socialism" (p 522).

The CPSU is following the Leninist course confidently. It is properly fulfilling the role of political leader of the working class and of the entire Soviet people. This is guaranteed by its inflexible loyalty to the ideas of scientific communism. "Marxism-Leninism," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said in the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th Party Congress, "is the only reliable base for the elaboration of a correct strategy and tactic. It gives us an understanding of historical prospects and enables us to determine the trend of socio-economic and political development for many years ahead, and to be properly guided in international events. The strength of Marxism-Leninism lies in its constant creative development. This is what Marx and Lenin taught. Our party will always be true to their legacy!" Marxism-Leninism has been, and remains, to all communists and all true revolutionaries the only reliable guide to the new life and the craving for it is also a craving for a communist future.

5403

CSO: 1802

FRATERNAL VIETNAM'S EXPLOITS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 123-126

[Review by N. Sergeyev of the following books: "Vooruzheniye Revolyutsionnykh Mass i Stroitel'stvo Narodnoy Armii" [Arming of the Revolutionary Masses and the Building of a People's Army] by Vo Nguyen Giap, Voenizdat, Moscow, 1977, 175 pp; "Put' k Pobede. Ocherk Bor'by za Natsional'nuyu Nezavisimost', Yedinstvo, Mir i Sotsializm vo V'yetname (1945-1976 gg.)" [Path to Victory. Essay on the Struggle for National Independence, Unity, Peace, and Socialism in Vietnam (1945-1976)], by S. Divil'kovskiy and I. Ognetov, Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 278 pp; "Indokitay: Put' k Miru (Indokitayskiye Problemy v Svete Sovremennogo Mezhdunarodnogo Prava)" [Indochina: The Way to Peace (Problems of Indochina in the Light of Contemporary International Law)], by Yu. Ya. Mikheyev, Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1977, 296 pp; "Vtoraya Vesna V'yetnama" [Vietnam's Second Spring], by V. Skvortsov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 175 pp; and "V'yetnam--Yedinyy ot Kao-lange do, Kamau" [One Vietnam from Kao lang to Camao], by M. M. Il'inskiy. Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 259 pp]

[Text] In the course of 1977-1978 our publishing houses published a number of books on the struggle waged by the Vietnamese people against imperialist aggression and for the independence and unity of the country, peace, and social progress. In fact, these editions were an acknowledgement of the great international significance of the exploits performed by the Vietnamese people and an expression of the sincerity and depth of feelings of friendship and solidarity of the Soviet people toward fraternal Vietnam.

The book by Socialist Republic of Vietnam Army General Vo Nguyen Giap, Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo member, vice premier, and minister of national defense, describes the principles and experience in organizing the armed struggle against foreign intervention and the puppet army. The author describes the way the Vietnamese communist party, based on the ideas of Marx, Engels, and Lenin on the military organization of the proletariat, developing them creatively, established the people's armed forces and was able to mobilize and arm the toiling masses and lead them to a truly nationwide resistance for the sake of freedom from imperialist enslavement and the total liberation of the country.

In their essay S. Divil'kovskiy and I. Ognetov provide an expanded description of the 30 years of struggle waged by the people of Vietnam for national independence and unity, starting with the proclamation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the resistance to the French colonial war to the final defeat of the American intervention, the full victory of the patriots, the abolishment of the anti-people's regime in the south, the reunification of the country within a single state--the Socialist Republic of Vietnam--and the beginning of a new stage in the Vietnamese revolution, the stage of the building of socialism on the scale of the entire country, as proclaimed at the Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam (1976).

The work by Yu. Mikheyev considers international aspects of the struggle waged by the peoples of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia from the viewpoint of the basic principles and norms of international law. Taking as an example the revolutionary movement in these countries, the author proves that the correctness and legitimacy of the national liberation struggle of the peoples against imperialism and neocolonialism gave it a broad international support.

The books by journalists V. Skvortsov (PRAVDA) and M. Il'inskiy (IZVESTIYA) consist of notes of people who have seen with their own eyes the strength of the liberation in the southern part of Vietnam and the long-awaited unification of the country. It is a story depicting vivid impressions of those days and, above all, people engaged in military and labor exploits, hammering out the great victory.

These works, different in genre and nature, bring together not only facts, dates, and documents, but, above all, the desire to interpret the origins and components of the victory achieved by the peoples of Vietnam and the other countries of Indochina, a victory which was also a crushing defeat for the forces of imperialism and local reaction.

Comrade Vo Nguyen Giap writes the following: "The country entered a new era in its history. The Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam summed up the results of the revolutionary struggle in the past, and formulated the general line of the Vietnamese revolution at the new stage. The Congress emphasized that the most important among all the factors which determined the great victory in the war of resistance against American aggression and for the salvation of the homeland, as well as the entire revolutionary cause of the Vietnamese people was the correct and creative political and military line followed by the party. Our victory is the victory of an aggressive strategy, of the art of command and organization of combat operations; it is the victory of the stern and fierce, adamant and firm, and heroic and wise struggle waged by our people and army; it is the victory of the combat solidarity of the peoples of the three fraternal countries--Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia; it is the victory of the combat solidarity of the forces of socialism, national independence, democracy and peace the world over" (pp 3-4).

As pointed out in the book "Indokitay: Put' k Miru," the significance of the victories won by the peoples of Indochina far exceeds the limits of that part of the globe: "They had, and continue to have, a profound impact on the situation in Southeast Asia, and on the whole of the Asian continent and throughout the world. That is why, so far, great attention is being paid by various countries throughout the world both to the study of the reasons for the victorious outcome of the struggle waged by the Indochinese patriots as well as the influence which this outcome has had on the further development of international relations" (pp 4-5).

The experience of the Vietnamese revolution enriched the common treasury of the international revolutionary movement. A number of topical conclusions and lessons may be drawn from this experience.

The three decades of heroic struggle waged by the Vietnamese people have instructively confirmed the fact that the aspiration toward national liberation and the reorganization of life on a socialist basis is insurmountable in the conditions of the changed overall ratio of forces in the international arena in favor of world socialism, and that in our time a limit could be imposed to the imperialist policy of aggression and arbitrariness. "Essentially," the authors of "Put' k Pobede" write, "this was a confrontation between the forces of socialism and peace, on the one hand, and imperialism and reaction, on the other, a confrontation which was legitimately won by socialism and peace" (p 3).

The victory in Vietnam embodied the single international character of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the universal nature of common laws governing the development of the revolutionary national-liberation struggle and transition to socialism, the universality of the influence of the ideas of the Great October Revolution, the power of the solidarity of the socialist countries, and the extent to which existing socialism is influencing the contemporary world.

The most important prerequisite for victory was the fact that at all stages of the revolution the Communist Party of Vietnam firmly held in its hands the banner of the struggle for independence, unity, and socialism, and was able to rally and lead under it the broadest possible popular masses. The historical characteristics of the revolutionary process in Vietnam, accurately refracted in the party's policy, also represented the implementation, over a relatively long period of time, of the organically interrelated national people's democratic revolution in the south, and the socialist revolution in the north of the country.

The precise definition and systematic implementation by the party of the strategic and tactical objectives and tasks at each stage of the struggle for national and social liberation won it nationwide support. The checking of the party's course and political concepts against the interests and expectations of the broadest possible masses triggered in the Vietnamese

people an inflexible spirit of firmness, heroism, self-sacrifice, and faith in the final victory--a spirit which distinguished its long years of struggle against all foreign aggressors and their local stooges. The communists strengthened and developed the closest possible ties with the masses not only in the favorable circumstances of the upsurge and offensive of the revolutionary forces but in the more complex and difficult conditions of defense against superior enemy forces. The party constantly sought and found effective organizational methods for the patriotic unification of the people. The organs of the broad single national front, based on the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, reliably served the consolidation of all patriotic forces in the struggle against foreign aggression and for the unification of the country. They rallied on a democratic basis around the party's policy the various political, religious, and social patriotic organizations, and all national ethnic groups and strata. The unification and organization of the masses around the party, as the most important factor for the victory, convincingly is described in these works.

All this enables us to understand why neither French nor American imperialists were able to create in the south of Vietnam a social base for neocolonialism, strengthen the positions of puppet pro-imperialist governments, and create and train their armies in the hope of "Vietnamizing" the colonial adventures of monopoly capital. Yet, the scale of the efforts undertaken by the United States was quite impressive. In 1974 the Saigon regime had 1.2 million soldiers, 280,000 policemen, a large secret gendarmerie, and detachments of the so-called local self-defense. Within a single year the United States shipped to Saigon two million tons of armaments, including 592 airplanes, 900 tanks and armored cars, 600 heavy artillery guns, and 240 navy ships. In terms of size Saigon's air force was at par with some developed capitalist countries. The United States gave the puppet army weapons worth \$5 billion.

This cumbersome neocolonialist armament proved incapable of withstanding the powerful wave of the people's resolve to liberate their country. V. Skvortsov cites the following fact: after the fall of Saigon the American journalists said that as estimated by Pentagon specialists themselves, on 10 March 1975 the infamous "Army of the Republic of Vietnam" was three times the size of the patriotic forces and had 10 times more fire power (p 45). Nevertheless, the puppet regime fell like a house of cards. It fell not only under the strikes of the militarily well trained liberation army and the rebels. It neither withstood nor could withstand the test for socio-political strength. The authors-journalists describe this through the faiths and thoughts of many members of the intelligentsia, peasants, and former soldiers in Saigon's army.

The revolution must be able to defend itself. This important Marxist-Leninist stipulation was confirmed by the experience of the struggle waged by the Vietnamese people. The book by Comrade Vo Nguyen Giap describes the way the party and people of Vietnam created powerful and truly people's armed forces, developing in them high combat and moral-political qualities, and formulating an effective military strategy and tactic. The people's armed forces

consisting of three categories were raised in the course of the war of resistance against the French colonizers and American imperialists: the people's army, consisting of regular and territorial forces; the people's militia, and the guerilla units which were the armed organizations of the masses.

The armed struggle waged by the people of Vietnam enriched revolutionary military science. The books under review describe the skill with which the patriots used guerilla warfare tactics to wear out the enemy which enjoyed temporary military superiority, with a view to subsequently converting to offensive operations, and the skillful and varied ways used to undermine the combat capability of enemy forces, combining guerilla and militia operations with strikes by regular sub-units and armed operations in rural areas with uprisings in cities, and the way they prepared and conducted decisive strategic mass operations, the vivid examples of which are the 1954 Dien Bien Phu and the 1975 offensive on Saigon.

International solidarity became a powerful factor in the victory won by the people of Vietnam. The Vietnamese communist party, created by the internationalist-Leninist Ho Chi Minh, approached the correlation between the national and international aspects in the struggle for national independence and socialism in the country from principle-minded positions. It tried to link it as closely as possible with the strengthening of the world socialist system and the international workers' and national-liberation movements, and with the progress of peace throughout the world.

The Vietnamese people highly rate the role which our country played in providing all-round aid and support to the struggle waged by Vietnam for national independence, against imperialist aggression, and in the implementation of the plans for laying the foundations for socialism on Vietnamese soil. Recently, in a message to the Society for Soviet-Vietnamese Friendship, on the occasion of its 20th anniversary, Comrade Le Tuan, Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee general secretary, wrote: "In the common struggle for the noble ideals of socialism and communism, the peoples of Vietnam and the Soviet Union always stood shoulder to shoulder, sharing joy and sadness, constantly supporting and inspiring one another. Vietnamese-Soviet friendship, for whose strengthening the Communist Party of Vietnam and the CPSU are tirelessly working, is constantly yielding its excellent results.

"Loyal to the instructions of President Ho Chi Minh and the Communist Party of Vietnam, the Vietnamese people will always remember the tremendous merits of Lenin and the Great October Revolution. They will always be grateful for the tremendous, all-round, and effective support and aid which the CPSU, the Soviet government, and the fraternal Soviet people gave Vietnam in two wars of resistance and are giving today in the building of socialism."

In their works the Soviet authors cite extensive data showing the tremendous practical significance of factual solidarity with Vietnam, and the

comprehensive political, military, economic, and diplomatic aid given the Vietnamese people by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and the support of Vietnam's right cause by the fraternal parties and the progressive organizations and movements throughout the world.

The lessons of the victory won by the Vietnamese people are instructive and topical also from the viewpoint of the crushing failure of American imperialist adventures in Vietnam. This, as we know, triggered an extremely painful reaction in the United States, affecting its ruling circles as well. In this connection a number of sober voices were heard stating that the United States should abandon its claim to being the world's policeman. Impressive figures were cited: the United States lost a war which involved the participation of up to 68 percent of its infantry, 60 percent of its marines, and 32 percent of its tactical and one-half of its strategic air force, and which cost a total of \$352 billion.

However, the dead are still holding on to the living. Many of the dirty ways and means of aggressive intervention in the domestic affairs of the peoples, tried in Vietnam, have been regained by the imperialist powers. It is no accident that in connection with the recent NATO intervention in Zaire and the "rigid" position held by the administration on African problems, healthy reminders appeared in the American press to the effect that the government is forgetting the lessons of Vietnam.

The Indochina events disclosed yet once again the imperialist tactics in the struggle against world socialism and the national-liberation movement, aimed at seeking means for a possible division of the unity of anti-imperialist forces. In particular, the U.S. ruling circles used to this purpose the reactionary and anti-socialist position held by the Chinese Maoist leadership. The world remembers that the Peking leaders repeatedly let Washington understand their "restraint" in connection with the escalating military operations conducted by the United States in Vietnam, and they declined the offer of the Soviet Union to consider jointly possible measures to support the Vietnamese people at a time when the United States mounted an air aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Subsequently, when the Peking leaders began to play up to Washington with a view to achieving a Sino-American rapprochement, the U.S. government tried to use Peking to exert pressure on the Vietnamese leadership to make it more "tractable" at the Paris talks.

The French colonizers in the past and, subsequently, the American imperialists launched adamant efforts to undermine the unity and solidarity among the peoples of the three countries--Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia--in the struggle against imperialist aggression and for their freedom and independence. However, they were unable to disturb the fraternal mutual aid and close relations among the liberation movements of these countries and their political vanguards. Unity of action and a strong combat alliance were important prerequisites for the successful struggle waged by the peoples of the three countries which resulted in total victory at virtually the same time.

The Peking leaders are trying to accomplish what the imperialists failed by concocting hegemonistic plans for Southeast Asia and assuming, following the victory of the Vietnamese people, a position of open hostility to unified socialist Vietnam. Conspiring with the leading Cambodian group, Peking encouraged it along the way of provocations against the Vietnamese people, including armed invasions of Vietnamese territory. Such a course is entirely conflicting with the national interests of the Cambodian people and the great traditions of solidarity among the peoples of the three Indochinese countries, strengthened by long years of joint anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggle.

The fraternal socialist countries, the communist and workers' parties, and all progressive peoples are indignant at the treasonable policy of the Chinese leadership toward the heroic people of Vietnam, whose exploit is one of the greatest pages in the struggle against imperialism and for the freedom and independence of the peoples, and peace and socialism. These feelings are fully shared by the Soviet communists and all Soviet people.

The Vietnamese people benefit from the comprehensive support and aid of the Soviet Union and of all members of the socialist comity as steadily in the course of peaceful socialist construction which developed within unified Vietnam, in accordance with the positions of the Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam, and in strengthening the international positions of socialist Vietnam, as during the war. Under conditions in which the fraternal Vietnamese people must resist a new growth pressure and threats from the outside, the Soviet Union confirmed its decisive support of Vietnam's efforts aimed at the building of a socialist society, improving the living conditions of the working people, and defending the inviolable sovereign rights and strengthening the international positions of the socialist republic of Vietnam--a reliable stronghold of socialism in Southeast Asia.

5403

CSO: 1802

JUDGMENT OF HISTORY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 78 pp 126-128

[Review by I. Tamginskiy of the book "Sud v Tokio" [Judgment in Tokyo] by L. N. Smirnov and Ye. B. Zaytsev, Voenizdat, Moscow, 1978, 544 pp]

[Text] Whereas the Nuremberg trials of the main military criminals has long become the subject of comprehensive studies in our literature, in this respect the Tokyo trial was unlucky for quite some time. Thus, it is no less instructive and, the more time passes, the more life itself has required the thorough dissection of anything related to it, of the history of the appearance of a dangerous hotbed of war in the Far East in the 1930's, and of the specific domestic political and international conditions under which the Japanese militarists planned and mounted their aggression against neighboring countries.

The recently published fundamental work written by well-known Soviet jurists and publicists helps to obtain a profoundly substantiated answer to these and other questions, and acquire a mass of additional information a considerable percentage of which is published for the first time. Based on rich factual data and personal observations, they acquaint the readers with the complex spectrum of problems encountered in the trial--one of the longest (two and a half years) and extensive in terms of documentation.

Armed with the contemporary methods of historical analysis, the authors were able to study and systematize a large amount of data. Suffice it to recall that the court transcripts and sentence alone cover 50,000 type-written pages on top of thousands of documents of exhibits presented by the prosecution and the defense.

The thought that not simply the main war criminals were being tried in Japan's capital but that, as was the case with the Nuremberg trial, ignoring the wishes of most bourgeois servants of justice (accounting for 10 of the 11 votes) another invisible defendant was present--imperialism with its politics and diplomacy which had thrown mankind into the abyss of World War II, runs through the entire vividly written book. This theme song is not something of the past. It is topical today as well, when the forces

of imperialist reaction, together with other adventurers, would like to ignore the lessons of history, are being energized again in the international arena.

There neither is nor could there be a justification for international robbery. This was confirmed, yet once again, by the absolute political and juridical groundlessness of all attempts to whitewash the war criminals, attempts which were made at the Tokyo trial. Here, at the International Military Tribunal, as in other similar cases, the task was not only to establish individual guilts but to recreate, by stages, the correct picture of the most bloodletting and tragic period in the life of mankind. This task was essentially carried out in accordance with democratic jurisprudence principles and the use of the entire arsenal of juridical means. The facts thus established were of exceptional veracity. They were so obvious that the court sentenced most of the defendants to the death penalty.

Prior to World War II there had been no case of an international trial of heads of imperialist countries, ministers, and commanders in chief of armed forces. Now they found themselves as defendants and under the fire of cross-examination. They had to tell the truth about their actions rather than, as is usually the case, leave their defendants memoirs in which bits of truth could be lost in rivers of lies. Using tricks, they frequently tried to lie to the court as well. However, they were immediately exposed by witnesses, experts, and secret documents bearing their signatures. Nothing saved them from exposure or deserved retribution.

It was specifically thus that Hideki Tojio, prime minister and minister of war between 1941 and 1944, and his accomplices, were exposed. The same fate befell the head of the diplomatic department, Yosuke Matsuoka, who, in the final account, personally testified to the fact that he had raised insidiousness, deception, and treachery to the level of state policy. The other organizers of Japan's aggression who, in comparison with the German and Italian fascists, had decided to redive the world at the cost of the lives of tens of millions of people and the enslavement of entire countries and continents, were equally unable to avoid their responsibility.

The militarists began their path to their objective by attacking China and engaging in armed provocations against the Soviet Union and Mongolia. "Japan, Manchukuo, and China will be merely the nucleus of the bloc of countries in the great East Asian sphere of common prosperity," they stated, intending to subordinate to their rule the peoples of southern Asia, Australia, and New Zealand (characteristically, the countries included in this area number many among those over whose territory the Peking leaders today have laid open claims). They called for Japan to be ready "to surmount all obstacles on its way, material and spiritual," and for "the implementation of an ideal assigned to it by the heavens themselves," and for "settling the outcome of world events in their own liking" (p 183).

The readers see a gallery of political portraits of maniacs on whose orders masses of civilian population were killed and maimed, towns and villages destroyed, and priceless monuments of world culture torn down. These are the portraits of those who wove imperialist intrigues, and selected and watched over puppets such as Emperor (Pu I) and corrupted the souls of the Japanese.

In this connection, the chapters "On the Traces of War Crimes," and "On Those Who Were Not Tried," are of unquestionable interest. Tracing the roots of the terrible crimes, nevertheless, with the help of facts the authors refute the pseudoscientific claims of bourgeois propaganda to the effect that the mass acts of barbarism committed in the course of military operations could be explained by the feeling of some sort of racial exclusivity. In fact, the reason is that, in itself, the unjust and aggressive nature of the war and the attempts to suppress through the force of arms the national-liberation struggle were accompanied by violations of the laws of humanity. Mass crimes are a method in waging such wars and the result of deliberate strategic planning, its essential element sanctioned at the highest governmental levels.

The Japanese monopolies and their masters were equally involved in this. It was only thanks to the protection of the American occupation powers that they were left untouched. However, their decisive role and guilt in starting the war were so obvious that the court particularly noted the fact even though in an impersonal manner (the sentence repeatedly referred to "industrialists," "bankers," and "jaybatsu"). The contemporary authors of the military-industrial complex who are trying to hinder detente and turn mankind to balancing on the brink of a nuclear missile war, should be reminded of this.

In this sense the most meaningful chapter "Beginning of the End" is quite instructive. It describes the way between 1938 and 1941 the then U.S. government was also playing its "Asian cards," by giving militaristic Japan various types of aid in developing its military potential. The policy of a "Far East Munich," pursued by Washington together with other Western capitals, aimed at directing the aggression of the Japanese militarists against the USSR, synchronizing it, if possible, with the attack launched by Hitlerite Germany, proved to be nearsighted.

Describing in detail American diplomatic maneuvers of the times, the authors cite the perceptive statement made by Vice President Henry Wallace in his letter to Roosevelt: " . . . The position of pacification . . . will unquestionably yield, in the final account, poor results regarding not only Japan but the situation in Europe as well . . . I hope, Mr. President, that you will remain absolutely firm in our relations with Japan . . . Any display of weakness, concession, or pacification would be misinterpreted by Japan and by the 'Axis,' and would cost us dearly" (pp 319-320). The warning was ignored. Aware of Japan's plans for

attacking the Soviet Union, the American command recommended to the President to abstain from launching countermeasures.

Pearl Harbor put an end to the hopes of the United States to avoid a clash with their imperialist rival in the Pacific. Who knows how many more casualties, including Japanese, World War II would have caused had not the Soviet Union entered it to accelerate the end of the war and submit to the court of nations those who launched it.

Thirty-three years have already passed since the end of the greatest drama of the century. Yet, to this day it faces us, forcing mankind to be vigilant in order to prevent a new catastrophe.

Even though describing the past, the book is turned to the present. "Judgment in Tokyo" is a warning to the supporters of militarism and to those who are trying to repeal the present Japanese constitution. This would be an instructive book for the political and state leaders of Japan who tend to structure their foreign policy on the basis of aggressive alliances and blocs and various types of dangerous combinations by promoting the contradictions among individual countries in the hope of gaining rather doubtful advantages.

Past experience eloquently proves the shortsightedness and ruinous nature of such a policy.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1978

5403

CSO: 1802

- END -